

Strong Coordination over Multi-hop Line Networks

Badri N. Vellambi, Jörg Kliewer
New Jersey Institute of Technology
Newark, NJ 07102

Email: badri.n.vellambi@ieee.org, jkliewer@njit.edu

Matthieu R. Bloch
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332
Email: matthieu.bloch@ece.gatech.edu

Abstract

We analyze the problem of strong coordination over a multi-hop line network in which the node initiating the coordination is a terminal network node. We assume that each node has access to a certain amount of randomness that is local to the node, and that the nodes share some common randomness, which are used together with explicit hop-by-hop communication to achieve strong coordination. We derive the trade-offs among the required rates of communication on the network links, the rates of local randomness available to network nodes, and the rate of common randomness to realize strong coordination. We present an achievable coding scheme built using multiple layers of channel resolvability codes, and establish several settings in which this scheme is proven to offer the best possible trade-offs.

Index Terms

Strong coordination, channel resolvability, channel synthesis, line network.

I. INTRODUCTION

Decentralized control is an essential feature in almost all large-scale networks such as the Internet, surveillance systems, sensor networks, traffic and power grid networks. Control in such networks is achieved in a distributed fashion by coordinating various actions and response signals of interest. Communication between various parts of the network serves an effective means to establish coordination. There exist two modes of communication to enable the overall goal of coordination.

- Coordination of a system through *explicit* communication refers to settings in which communication signals extrinsic to the control and coordination of the system are sent from one part of system to another to specifically coordinate/control the system [3]. In this case, the signals used for communication are not part of the signals to be coordinated.
- Coordination of a system through *implicit* communication refers to scenarios in which the signals inherently sent from one part of the system to another in its natural operation are also used to coordinate/control the system [4]–[6]. In this case, some of the communication signals form a subset of the signals to be coordinated.

The problem of coordination through (either modes of) communication is very closely tied to a slew of information-theoretic problems, including intrinsic randomness, resolvability, and random number generation [7]–[10], channel resolvability, channel simulation and synthesis [10]–[14], and distributed random variable generation [15], [16]. Consequently, many ideas for the design of codes for these problems heavily feature in the design of coordination codes. Two notions of coordination have been studied in the literature:

- *empirical* coordination, where the aim is to closely match the empirical distribution of the actions/signals at network nodes with a prescribed target histogram/probability mass function; and
- *strong* coordination, where the aim is the generation of actions at various network nodes that are collectively required to resemble the output of a jointly correlated source. In this setting, by observing jointly the actions

of the network nodes, a statistician cannot determine (with significant confidence) as to whether the actions were generated by a jointly correlated source or from a coordination scheme.

A compendious introduction to the fundamental limits and optimal coding strategies for empirical and strong coordination in many canonical networks (e.g., one-hop, broadcast, relay networks) can be found in [3]. However, the majority of the networks considered therein comprised of two or and three terminals. The limits and means of the empirical coordination of a discrete memoryless source with a receiver connected by a point-to-point noisy channel was explored in [17]–[19]. The effects of causality of encoding and channel feedback were investigated in [19], and the benefits of channel state information available acausally at the encoder was explored in [17], [18].

Coordination over the more general three-terminal setting in the presence of a relay was considered in [20]–[22]. Inner and outer bounds of the required rates of communication for coordination were derived in [20], [21]. Note that [20] focuses on strong coordination and only one-way communication, whereas [21] focuses on strong coordination and two-way communication with actions required only at the end terminals (and not at the relay). Inner and outer bounds for the required rates of communication for coordination over a noiseless triangular network with relay was studied in [22]. The fundamental limits and optimal schemes for empirical coordination with implicit communication over multiple-access channels with state were explored in [23], [24].

In this work, we quantify the network resources required for achieving *strong* correlation in multi-hop line networks. By network resources, we mean three quantities required for establishing strong coordination: (a) the rates of hop-by-hop communication between network nodes; (b) the rate of randomness locally available to each node; and (c) the required rate of common randomness shared by all network nodes. This problem is closely related to those considered in [20], [25], [26]. In [26], the strong coordination rate region for two- and multi-hop line networks is characterized under the secrecy constraint that an eavesdropper does not additionally learn anything about the joint statistics of the actions even when they observe the communication on the network links. This work does not consider this additional secrecy requirement. It presents a general achievability scheme that is proven to be optimal in the following cases:

- when there is sufficient common randomness shared by all the nodes in the network;
- when the intermediate nodes operate in a *functional* regime in which intermediate-node processing is a deterministic function of the incoming messages and the common randomness alone; and
- when common randomness is absent, and the actions form a Markov chain that is aligned with the network topology.

The remainder of this work is organized as follows. Section II presents the notation used in this work. Section III presents the formal definition of the strong coordination problem, and Section IV presents the main results of this work. Finally, this work is concluded in Section V followed by appendices containing proofs of relevant results in Section IV and some ancillary results.

II. NOTATION

For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m < n$, $\llbracket m, n \rrbracket \triangleq \{m, m+1, \dots, n\}$. Uppercase letters (e.g., X, Y) denote random variables (RVs), and the respective script versions (e.g., $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$) denote their alphabets. In this work, all alphabets are assumed to be finite. Lowercase letters denote the realizations of random variables (e.g., x, y). Superscripts indicate the length of vectors. Single subscripts always indicate the node indices. In case of double subscripts, the first indicates the node index, and the next indicates the component (i.e., time) index. Given a finite set S , $\text{unif}(S)$ denotes the uniform probability mass function (pmf) on the set. Given a pmf p_X , $\text{supp}(p_X)$ indicates the support of p_X , and $T_\varepsilon^n[p_X]$ denotes the set of all ε -letter typical sequences of length n [27]. Given two pmfs p and q on the same alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, with $\text{supp}(q) \subseteq \text{supp}(p)$, $D_{\text{KL}}(p||q) = \sum_x p(x) \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}$. Given an event E , $\mathbb{P}(E)$ denotes the probability of occurrence of the event E . The expectation operator is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$. Lastly, $p_{X_1 \dots X_k}^{\otimes n}$ denotes the pmf of n i.i.d. random k -tuples, with each k -tuple correlated according to pmf $p_{X_1 \dots X_k}$.

III. PROBLEM DEFINITION

The line coordination problem is a multi-hop extension of the one studied in [25], and is depicted in Fig. 1. For the sake of completeness, the problem is formally defined here.

A line network consisting of h nodes (Nodes $1, \dots, h$) and $h-1$ links (modeled as noiseless bit pipes) that connect Node i with Node $i+1$, $1 \leq i < h$ is given. Node 1 is specified an action sequence $\{X_{1,i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, an i.i.d process with




Fig. 1. The strong coordination problem setup.

each $X_{1,i}$ distributed over a finite set $\mathcal{X}_1$ according to pmf Q_{X_1} . Nodes are assumed to possess local randomness, as well as common randomness shared by all h nodes to enable *strong coordination* using block codes. A block code of length n uses n symbols of the specified action (i.e., X_1^n), and common and local randomness to generate actions $\hat{X}_i^n$ at Nodes i , $i > 2$ satisfying the following condition: the joint statistics of actions $(X_1^n, \hat{X}_2^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n)$ and those of n symbols output by a given discrete memoryless source $Q_{X_1...X_h}^{\otimes n}$ are nearly indistinguishable under the variational distance metric. The overall aim is to characterize the required rates of communication messages and randomness (both common and local) to achieve such strong coordination. The following definitions are now in order.

Definition 1: Given joint pmf $Q_{X_1...X_h}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, a strong coordination ε -code of length n at a rate tuple $(R_c, R_1, \dots, R_{h-1}, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_h) \in \mathbb{R}^{+2h}$ is a collection of $h + 1$ independent and uniform random variables $(M_c, M_{L_1}, \dots, M_{L_h})$, $h - 1$ message-generating functions $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{h-1}$, and $h - 1$ action-generating functions $\phi_2, \dots, \phi_h$ such that:

- Randomness constraints:

$$[\text{Common}] M_c \sim \text{unif}([1, 2^{nR_c}]), \quad (1)$$

$$[\text{Local}] M_{L_i} \sim \text{unif}([1, 2^{n\rho_i}]), \quad i = 1, \dots, h. \quad (2)$$

- Message-generation and action-generation constraints:

$$l_1 \triangleq \psi_1(M_{L_1}, X_1^n, M_c) \in [1, 2^{nR_1}], \quad (3)$$

$$l_j \triangleq \psi_j(M_{L_j}, l_{j-1}, M_c) \in [1, 2^{nR_j}], \quad 2 \leq j < h, \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{X}_j^n \triangleq \phi_j(M_{L_j}, l_{j-1}, M_c), \quad 2 \leq j \leq h. \quad (5)$$

- Strong coordination constraint:

$$\|Q_{X_1}^{\otimes n} Q_{\hat{X}_2^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n | X_1^n} - Q_{X_1...X_h}^{\otimes n}\| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (6)$$

where $Q_{\hat{X}_2^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n | X_1^n}$ is the conditional pmf of the actions generated at Nodes $2, \dots, h$ that is induced by the code. ■

Definition 2: A tuple $\mathbf{R} \triangleq (R_c, R_1, \dots, R_{h-1}, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_h) \in \mathbb{R}^{+2h}$ is said to be *achievable* for strong coordination of actions according to $Q_{X_1...X_h}$ if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a strong coordination ε -code of some length $n \in \mathbb{N}$ at $\mathbf{R}$. Further, the $2h$ -dimensional strong coordination capacity region is defined as the closure of the set of all achievable rate vectors. ■

One straightforward observation is that if $H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1) = 0$, i.e., $X_2, \dots, X_h$ are (deterministic) functions of X_1 , then there is no need for local or common randomness, and the strong coordination problem becomes purely a communication problem with the following rate region.

Remark 1: If $H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1) = 0$, then $(R_c, R_1, \dots, R_{h-1}, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_h) \in \mathbb{R}^{+2h}$ is achievable iff

$$R_\ell \geq H(X_{\ell+1}, \dots, X_h), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, h - 1 \quad \blacksquare$$

So without loss of generality, we may assume for the rest of this work that the above remark does not apply to the given pmf $Q_{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_h}$. Before we proceed to the results, we introduce three possible modes of operation for intermediate nodes. These three modes highlighted in Fig. 2 vary depending on the message generation at each intermediate node, and are as follows.

- In the *functional* mode given in Fig. 2(a), the outgoing message at each intermediate node is generated from the incoming message and common randomness, i.e., the local randomness at an intermediate node is used only to generate the action corresponding to the node.




Fig. 2. Three possible encoder structures.

- In the *action-dependent* mode given in Fig. 2 (b), the intermediate node uses the incoming message, and local and common randomness to generate the node's action. The outgoing message is then generated using the incoming message, common randomness, and the generated action. Hence, in this mode, local randomness at a node can affect the next-hop message only through the generated action; and finally,
- In the *unrestricted* mode given in Fig. 2 (c), both the action and the next-hop message generated at an intermediate node depend on the incoming message, and local and common randomness.

In theory, the set of rate vectors achievable using the unrestricted mode is a superset of those achievable using the action-dependent mode, which is in turn a superset of those achievable by the functional mode. Further, these inclusions are, in general, strict (see the discussion at the end of Section IV). Before we present the achievable coding scheme for strong coordination, we present the following lemmas, which characterize the rate-transfer arguments to the problem at hand.

Lemma 1: If strong coordination is achievable under the unrestricted mode of operation using a common randomness rate R_c , local randomness rates $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_h)$ and communication rates $(R_1, \dots, R_{h-1})$, then:

- For any $1 \leq \ell \leq h$ and $\delta \leq \rho_\ell$, strong coordination is also achievable under the unrestrictive mode of operation using a common randomness rate $R_c + \delta$, local randomness rates $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\ell-1}, \rho_\ell - \delta, \rho_{\ell+1}, \dots, \rho_h)$ and communication rates $(R_1, \dots, R_{h-1})$; and
- For any $1 < \ell \leq h$ and $\delta \leq \rho_\ell$, strong coordination is also achievable under the unrestrictive mode of operation using a common randomness rate R_c , local randomness rates $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\ell-1} + \delta, \rho_\ell - \delta, \rho_{\ell+1}, \dots, \rho_h)$ and communication rates $(R_1, \dots, R_{\ell-2}, R_{\ell-1} + \delta, R_\ell, \dots, R_{h-1})$.

Proof: The first rate-transfer argument follows from the fact that local randomness rate at any node can be transferred onto common randomness rate, because a part of common randomness can always be used by precisely one node in the network to boost its local randomness. The second rate transfer follows from that fact that unused/excess local randomness at a node can be transmitted to the next-hop node to boost its local randomness when intermediate nodes operate in the unrestricted mode. ■

Lemma 2: If strong coordination is achievable in the action-dependent (or functional) mode of operation using a common randomness rate R_c , local randomness rates $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_h)$ and communication rates $(R_1, \dots, R_{h-1})$, then:

- For any $1 \leq \ell \leq h$ and $\delta \leq \rho_\ell$, strong coordination is also achievable under the action-dependent (or functional) mode of operation using a common randomness rate $R_c + \delta$, local randomness rates $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\ell-1}, \rho_\ell - \delta, \rho_{\ell+1}, \dots, \rho_h)$ and communication rates $(R_1, \dots, R_{h-1})$; and
- For any $1 < \ell \leq h$ and $\delta \leq \rho_\ell$, strong coordination is also achievable under the action-dependent (or functional) mode of operation using a common randomness rate R_c , local randomness rates $(\rho_1 + \delta, \dots, \rho_{\ell-1}, \rho_\ell - \delta, \rho_{\ell+1}, \dots, \rho_h)$ and communication rates $(R_1 + \delta, R_1 + \delta, \dots, R_{\ell-1} + \delta, R_\ell, \dots, R_{h-1})$.

Proof: The first rate-transfer argument follows from the same argument as that for the first rate-transfer argument in Lemma 1. The second rate transfer follows from that fact that unused/excess local randomness at the first node can be transmitted to any other node to boost its local randomness. Note that intermediate nodes cannot forward unused/excess local randomness to nodes down the line when operating in the functional or action-dependent mode. ■

IV. RESULTS

We first begin with the inner bound and then present specific settings for which we derive matching outer bounds. Throughout this work, we do not explicitly determine the cardinalities of the auxiliary RV alphabets. The

cardinalities can be bounded using Carathéodory's theorem [28].

A. Inner Bound: An Achievable Scheme

The approach for the design of strong coordination codes combines ideas from channel resolvability codes [3], [10], [16] and channel synthesis [13]. In order to design a strong coordination code, we look at an allied problem of generating h actions $\hat{X}_1^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n$ from uniform and independent random variables (a.k.a. indices) such that the joint pmf of the generated actions $Q_{\hat{X}_1^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n}$ satisfies:

$$\|Q_{\hat{X}_1^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n} - Q_{X_1^n \dots X_h^n}^{\otimes n}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad (7)$$

The approach in this work is the design of the strong coordination code using channel resolvability codes, and has three major tasks as described below.

- **Task 1:** The first task is to devise a scheme to generate the h sources, which is termed as the *allied action-generation problem*. To do so, first, a suitable structure of auxiliary RVs is chosen, and a codebook structure based on the chosen auxiliary RV structure is constructed. Independent and uniformly distributed indices are used to select the codewords from the codebook, and appropriate *test channels* are used to generate the h actions satisfying the above strong coordination requirement. Note that the auxiliary RV and codebook structure, and the corresponding test channels must be such that actions are generated in a distributed fashion.
- **Task 2:** The next task is to assign subsets of indices as common randomness, local randomness at each node, and messages to be communicated between nodes.
- **Task 3:** The last task is to then invert the operation at Node 1, which transforms the operation of generating the action at Node 1 to generating the messages intended of communication from the specified action.

An illustration of the three steps for the three-node setting is given in Fig. 3. Note that much of the detail presented therein such as the exact structure and form of the auxiliary RVs, test channels and the assignments to the network resources (communication, local randomness and common randomness rates) will be presented in due course. Note that in the figure $X \hookrightarrow Y$ indicates that the RV X is associated as a part of the RV Y , and hence a part of Y is used to realize X . As of now, the figure is only intended to indicate the overall procedure. However, we will repeatedly refer back to this figure (and the tasks) as we develop various technical aspects of the strong coordination scheme. Let us now proceed with the details of this scheme.

1) *Choice of Auxiliary Random Variables (Task 1):* We use $\binom{n}{2} + 2h - 2$ auxiliary RVs in a specific way to generate the h actions in the allied problem. For an illustration of the auxiliary RV structure for $h = 3$ for the allied action-generation problem, the reader is directed to Fig. 4. The details of this auxiliary RV structure is as follows:

- There are three different groups of Auxiliary RVs collectively indicated by the letters A, B , and C . There are $\binom{h}{2}$ random variables $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, $h - 1$ random variables $\{B_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$, and $h - 1$ random variables $\{C_i : 1 \leq i \leq h\}$.
- For $1 \leq i < j \leq h$, auxiliary RV $A_{i,j}$ represents message generated at Node i intended for Node j and hence can be used by Nodes $i, i + 1, \dots, j$.
- For each $1 \leq i < j \leq h$, we impose the following Markov chain.

$$A_{i,j} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{\Phi(i,j)} \leftrightarrow \{A_{i',j'} : 1 \leq i' < j' \leq h\} \setminus \{A_{i,j}\}, \quad (8)$$

where we let

$$\Phi(i,j) \triangleq \{(i',j') : i' \leq i < j \leq j'\} \setminus \{(i,j)\} \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_S = \{A_s\}_{s \in S}, \quad S \subseteq \{(i,j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\} \quad (10)$$

Note that $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi(i,j)}$ represent messages that are generated by nodes prior to Node i and are intended for nodes situated after Node j . Hence, each Node k , $i \leq k \leq j$, plays a role in communicating $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi(i,j)}$ to their intended nodes, Nodes $i, \dots, j$ will have access to the codewords corresponding to $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi(i,j)}$. Hence, we can allow arbitrary correlation between $A_{i,j}$ and $A_{\Phi(i,j)}$. For each $(i',j') \notin \Phi(i,j) \triangleq \Phi(i,j) \cup \{(i,j)\}$, there is at least one k' such that $i \leq k' \leq j$ and Node k' does not have access to $A_{i',j'}$. Hence, only those joint pmfs that satisfy these Markov chains are amenable for constructing codebooks. Fig. 4 presents an illustration of $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi(1,2)}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi(2,3)}$ when $h = 3$ and $h = 4$, respectively. In the figure, the subset of auxiliary RVs that are connected




Fig. 3. Transforming a solution to the problem of generating h sources to one for the strong coordination problem.




Fig. 4. An illustration of the structure of auxiliary random variables when $h = 3, 4$.

to each auxiliary RV $A_{i,j}$ collectively form $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi(i,j)}$. Further, (8) also implies that for any $1 \leq i < j \leq h$ and $1 \leq i' < j' \leq h$ such that $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$,

$$A_{i,j} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{\Phi(i,j) \cap \Phi(i',j')} \leftrightarrow A_{i',j'}. \quad (11)$$

Pictorially, what this condition translates to is that two auxiliary RVs $A_{i,j}$ and $A_{i',j'}$ are conditionally independent given the subset of all auxiliary RVs that are connected to both of them.

- For each $i = 1, \dots, h-1$, auxiliary RV $B_{i,i+1}$ is generated by Node i using all its available messages and is intended for Node $i+1$ one hop away. At a first glance, it may seem that $A_{i,i+1}$ and $B_{i,i+1}$ play the same role, and hence only one of them need to be present. However, this is not true and Example 1 below sheds light on why these auxiliary RVs play distinct roles.

As will become clear at the end of this section, in the allied action-generation problem, random variables $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ are determined prior to the generation of any action sequence, i.e., $\hat{X}_2^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n$.

However, for each $1 \leq i < h$, $B_{i,i+1}$ will be identified after the action $\hat{X}_i^n$ is generated. This will become evident as we describe the joint pmf of the actions and the auxiliary RVs, and the order of codebook generation.

- Lastly, the $h - 1$ auxiliary RVs $\{C_2, \dots, C_h\}$ are introduced to quantify the use of local randomness required at each node in the network. The messages corresponding to the codewords of these auxiliary RVs are not communicated between nodes.

Now that we have loosely defined the roles of the auxiliary RVs, we define the joint pmf of the actions and auxiliary RVs $Q_{A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}, B_{1,2}, \dots, B_{h-1,h}, C_2, \dots, C_h, X_1, \dots, X_h}$ that we aim to emulate to be

$$Q_{A_{1,2} \dots A_{h-1,h}} Q_{X_1 | A_{\Psi(1)}} \prod_{j=1}^{h-1} \left(Q_{B_{j,j+1} | X_j A_{\Phi(j,j+1)}} Q_{C_{j+1} | A_{\Psi(j+1)} B_{j,j+1}} Q_{X_{j+1} | A_{\Psi(j+1)} B_{j,j+1} C_{j+1}} \right), \quad (12)$$

where $Q_{A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}}$ satisfies the conditions described by (8). In the above equation,

$$\bar{\Phi}(i, j) \triangleq \Phi(i, j) \cup \{(i, j)\}, \quad (13)$$

$$\Psi(i) \triangleq \{(i', j') : i' \leq i \leq j', i' \neq j'\}. \quad (14)$$

Note that $A_{\bar{\Phi}(i,j)}$ is exactly the set of all A -auxiliary RVs that Nodes $i, \dots, j$ have access to, and $A_{\Psi(i)}$ represents all the auxiliary RVs that are generated in Nodes $1, \dots, i$ that are intended for Nodes $i, \dots, h$. An illustration of $\Phi(1, 2)$, $\bar{\Phi}(1, 2)$, $\Psi(2)$ for $h = 3$ and $\Phi(2, 3)$, $\bar{\Phi}(2, 3)$, $\Psi(3)$ for $h = 4$ can be found in Fig. 4. Note that the choice of the auxiliary RVs in (12) must be such that

$$Q_{X_1 \dots X_h} = Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}. \quad (15)$$

We would like to remark that ideally, it is preferable that there be only one RV per hop that encapsulates the role of the message that is conveyed on a hop. However, we do not have the necessary tools to establish that, and the joint pmf in (12) is the most general structure of RVs for which we are able to develop an achievable scheme. Here's an example to illustrate the difference between $A_{i,i+1}$ and $B_{i,i+1}$ in this joint pmf.

Example 1: Let $h = 3$. Suppose that we build a scheme with auxiliary RVs $A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}$, i.e., we set $B_{1,2}$ and $B_{2,3}$ as constant RVs. Then the joint pmf that we can emulate is given by

$$Q_{A_{1,2} A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}} Q_{X_1 | A_{1,2} A_{1,3}} Q_{X_2 | A_{1,2} A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}} Q_{X_3 | A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}}. \quad (16)$$

Since we have $A_{1,2} \leftrightarrow A_{1,3} \leftrightarrow A_{2,3}$ we see that the joint pmf can be rearranged as

$$Q_{A_{1,3}} Q_{X_1, A_{1,2} | A_{1,3}} Q_{X_2 | A_{1,2} A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}} Q_{A_{2,3}, X_3 | A_{1,3}}. \quad (17)$$

In other words, we have $I(X_1; X_3 | A_{1,3}) = 0$. Therefore, when $B_{1,2}$ and $B_{2,3}$ are set as constant RVs, X_1 and X_3 must be conditionally independent given $A_{1,3}$, which is a restriction on the choice of $A_{1,3}$.

Now, consider the case that $A_{1,2}$ and $A_{2,3}$ are constant RVs. Then the joint pmf that we can emulate is given by

$$Q_{A_{1,3}} Q_{X_1 | A_{1,3}} Q_{B_{1,2} | X_1, A_{1,3}} Q_{X_2 | B_{1,2}, A_{1,3}} Q_{B_{2,3} | X_2, A_{1,3}} Q_{X_3 | B_{2,3}, A_{1,3}} \quad (18)$$

$$= Q_{A_{1,3}, X_1, B_{1,2}} Q_{X_2 | B_{1,2}, A_{1,3}} Q_{B_{2,3} | X_2, A_{1,3}} Q_{X_3 | B_{2,3}, A_{1,3}}. \quad (19)$$

It can be seen that when $A_{1,2}$ and $A_{2,3}$ are constant RVs, $X_1 \leftrightarrow A_{1,3} \leftrightarrow X_3$ need not hold. Hence, employing non-trivial $(B_{1,2}, B_{2,3})$ or $(A_{1,2}, A_{2,3})$ allows for different choices for $A_{1,3}$, which in turn could potentially translate into different resource requirements. ■

While the above example illustrates the difference, a discussion on the need for the B auxiliary RVs is presented at the end of this work in Section IV-D.

Note that we eventually require that the actions be generated in a distributed fashion at various network nodes. This requirement is incorporated into the structure of the joint pmf of (12) via the following conditional independence property.

Remark 2: For any joint pmf of (12), we have for $i = 1, \dots, h$:

$$X_i \leftrightarrow (A_{\Psi(i)}, B_{i-1,i}, B_{i,i+1}) \leftrightarrow (X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_h, A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}, B_{1,2}, \dots, B_{h-1,h}). \quad (20)$$

Further, for $j = 1, \dots, h - 1$,

$$X_{j+1} \leftrightarrow (A_{\Psi(j+1)}, X_j) \leftrightarrow (X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}) \quad (21)$$

$$C_{j+1} \leftrightarrow (A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}, B_{j,j+1}) \leftrightarrow (X_1, \dots, X_j). \quad (22)$$

Thus, if we provide each Node i with an instance of auxiliary RVs $(A_{\Psi(i)}, B_{i-1,i}, B_{i,i+1})$ that are jointly correlated according to the marginal derived from (12), then we can generate actions $(X_1, \dots, X_h)$ in a *distributed* fashion. ■

We now present the precise codebook structure and construction that we use to emulate (12).

2) *Codebook Construction (Task 1)*: Since we have to develop codebooks that incorporate the specific structure of auxiliary RVs, we use the following ordering of pairs of indices to construct the codebooks. We define for $i < j$, $i' < j'$ and $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$, the following relation to define the codebooks in Fig. 4.

$$(i, j) \succ (i', j') \Leftrightarrow i < i' \text{ or } (i = i' \text{ and } j \geq j'). \quad (23)$$

This relation induces the following total ordering on the pairs of node indices.

$$(1, h) \succ (1, h-1) \succ \dots \succ (1, 2) \succ (2, h) \succ \dots \succ (2, 3) \succ (3, h) \succ \dots \succ (3, 4) \succ \dots \succ (h-1, h). \quad (24)$$

The codebooks are constructed using the above order starting from the leftmost index pair. To define the codebooks, we define the rates for each codewords as in Table I. Notice that we assign two rates for each of the codebooks for A - and B -auxiliary RVs and only one for the C -codebook. For each of the A - and B -auxiliary RV codebooks, one of the rates (with the superscript $+$) will correspond to communicated messages, and the other (with the superscript $-$), will not. The rates corresponding to the superscript $-$ will eventually be interpreted as common randomness.

TABLE I
CODEBOOK PARAMETERS AND NOTATION

Auxiliary RV	Rates, alphabets of indices, and codebook indices	
$A_{i,j}$ ($1 \leq i < j \leq h$)	$(\mu_{i,j}^+, \mu_{i,j}^-) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$	
	$\mathcal{M}_{i,j}^+ \triangleq [1, 2^{n\mu_{i,j}^+}]$	$\mathcal{M}_{i,j}^\pm \triangleq \mathcal{M}_{i,j}^+ \times \mathcal{M}_{i,j}^-$
	$\mathcal{M}_{i,j}^- \triangleq [1, 2^{n\mu_{i,j}^-}]$	$m_{i,j}^\pm \triangleq (m_{i,j}^+, m_{i,j}^-) \in \mathcal{M}_{i,j}^\pm$
$B_{i,i+1}$ ($1 \leq i < h$)	$(\kappa_i^+, \kappa_i^-) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$	
	$\mathcal{K}_i^+ \triangleq [1, 2^{n\kappa_i^+}]$	$\mathcal{K}_i^\pm \triangleq \mathcal{K}_i^+ \times \mathcal{K}_i^-$
	$\mathcal{K}_i^- \triangleq [1, 2^{n\kappa_i^-}]$	$k_i^\pm \triangleq (k_i^+, k_i^-) \in \mathcal{K}_i^\pm$
C_i ($1 < i \leq h$)	$\lambda_i \in (0, \infty)$	
	$\mathcal{L}_i \triangleq [1, 2^{n\lambda_i}]$	
	$l_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$	

Let us introduce this last set of notation to make our description easier to follow.

$$\mathcal{M}_S^\pm \triangleq \bigtimes_{(i',j') \in S} (\mathcal{M}_{i',j'}^+ \times \mathcal{M}_{i',j'}^-), \quad S \subseteq \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbf{m}_S^\pm \triangleq \{m_s^\pm\}_{s \in S}, \quad S \subseteq \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathbf{m}^\pm \triangleq (m_{1,2}^\pm, \dots, m_{h-1,h}^\pm), \quad (27)$$

$$\mathbf{m}^+ \triangleq (m_{1,2}^+, \dots, m_{h-1,h}^+), \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{m}^- \triangleq (m_{1,2}^-, \dots, m_{h-1,h}^-). \quad (29)$$

We now proceed to discuss the exact steps in the codebook construction.

- A1** For each $m_{1,h}^\pm \in \mathcal{M}_{1,h}^+ \times \mathcal{M}_{1,h}^-$, generate codeword $A_{1,h}^n(m_{1,h}^\pm)$ randomly using $Q_{A_{1,h}}$.
- A2** For each $1 \leq i < j \leq h$ and $1 \leq i' < j' \leq h$ such that $(i, j) \succ (i', j')$, the codebook for $A_{i,j}$ is constructed before the codebook for $A_{i',j'}$. By design, the codebook for $A_{i',j'}$ is constructed after the codebooks for $A_{i'',j''}$, $(i'', j'') \in \Phi(i', j')$.
- A3** For each $1 \leq i < j \leq h$, $\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm \in \mathcal{M}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm$, generate codeword $A_{i,j}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm)$ randomly using $Q_{A_{i,j}|A_{\Phi(i,j)}}$, and previously chosen $A_{\Phi(i,j)}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm)$.
- A4** For each $1 \leq i < h$, $(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,i+1)}^\pm, k_i^\pm) \in \mathcal{M}_{\Phi(i,i+1)}^\pm \times \mathcal{K}_i^\pm$, generate codeword $B_{i,i+1}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,i+1)}^\pm, k_i^\pm)$ using $Q_{B_{i,i+1}|A_{\Phi(i,i+1)}}$, and previously chosen $A_{\Phi(i,i+1)}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,i+1)}^\pm)$.




Fig. 5. An illustration of the structure of codebooks when $h = 3$.

A5 For each $1 < i \leq h$, $(\mathbf{m}_{\Psi(i)}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm, l_i) \in \mathcal{M}_{\Psi(i)}^\pm \times \mathcal{K}_{i-1}^\pm \times \mathcal{L}_i$, generate codeword $C_i^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Psi(i)}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm, l_i)$ using $Q_{C_i|A_{\Psi(i)}B_{i-1,i}}$, and previously chosen $A_{\Psi(i)}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Psi(i)}^\pm)$ and $B_{i-1,i}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Psi(i)}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm)$.

An illustration of the structure of the codebooks for $h = 3$ is given in Fig. 5, where an incoming arrow indicates that a codebook is constructed conditionally on all the codewords of the codebooks from which there are incoming arrows. For example, the codebook for $A_{1,2}(\mathbf{m}_{1,3}, \mathbf{m}_{1,2})$ is constructed conditionally on the codeword $A_{1,3}(\mathbf{m}_{1,3})$ in the $A_{1,3}$ -codebook, since $\mathbf{A}_{\Phi(1,2)} = A_{1,3}$, and the codebook for C_2 is constructed conditionally on the codebooks of $(\mathbf{A}_{\Psi(2)}, B_{1,2}) = (A_{1,3}, A_{1,2}, A_{2,3}, B_{1,2})$. In each codebook, the index/indices in black indicate the codebook index, and the index/indices in red indicate the codeword index within the codebook. For example, for C_2 codebooks there are $2^{\sum_{(i',j') \in \Psi(2)} (\mu_{i',j'}^+ + \mu_{i',j'}^-) + \kappa_1^+ + \kappa_1^-}$ codebooks constructed, each with $2^{nr\lambda_2}$ codewords, and $(\mathbf{m}_{\Psi(2)}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_1^\pm) = (\mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_1^\pm)$ provides the C_2 codebook index whereas l_2 indicates the codeword index within this codebook.

For the sake of simplicity, we introduce the following notation.

$$\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm) \triangleq (A_{1,2}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(1,2)}^\pm), \dots, A_{h-1,h}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(h-1,h)}^\pm)), \quad (30)$$

$$B_{i-1,i}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm) \triangleq B_{i-1,i}^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i-1,i)}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm), \quad i = 2, \dots, h, \quad (31)$$

$$C_i^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm, l_i) \triangleq C_i^n(\mathbf{m}_{\Psi(i)}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm, l_i), \quad i = 2, \dots, h. \quad (32)$$

The following example (as well as Fig. 5) presents an illustration of the above notation.

Example 2: For $h = 3$, the above notation translates to the following.

$$\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm) \triangleq (A_{1,3}^n(\mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm), A_{1,2}^n(\mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm), A_{2,3}^n(\mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm)), \quad (33)$$

$$B_{1,2}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_1^\pm) \triangleq B_{1,2}^n(\mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_1^+, \mathbf{k}_1^-), \quad (34)$$

$$B_{2,3}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_2^\pm) \triangleq B_{2,3}^n(\mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_2^+, \mathbf{k}_2^-), \quad (35)$$

$$C_2^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_1^\pm, l_2) \triangleq C_2^n(\mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_1^+, \mathbf{k}_1^-, l_2), \quad (36)$$

$$C_2^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_1^\pm, l_2) \triangleq C_2^n(\mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{m}_{1,3}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_2^+, \mathbf{k}_2^-, l_3). \quad (37)$$

■

Note that we have so far neither specified the rates $\mu_{i,j}^+, \mu_{i,j}^-, \kappa_{i,i+1}^+, \kappa_{i,i+1}^-$, and λ_i in the above description, nor have we described how the codewords are going to be selected for generating the actions. In the following, we will identify the required rates so that appropriate channel resolvability code design techniques can be employed to generate the actions.

3) *Identifying Codebook Rates (Task 1)*: In order to identify the rates for the various codebooks, let us divide the allied action-generation problem into h subproblems whose solutions will be pieced together to form a solution for the allied action-generation problem. Consider h subproblems illustrated in Fig. 6, and formally defined below.




Fig. 6. The h subproblems.

Definition 3: Problem 1 pertains to characterization of the rates required for codebooks corresponding to auxiliary RVs $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}$. Let for a given realization of the codebooks for $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$,

$$\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n}^{(1)}(\cdot) \triangleq \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} Q_{X_1 \dots X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-))}} \quad (38)$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}} Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{j=2}^h \frac{Q_{X_j X_{j-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{Q_{X_{j-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}}{2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-))}} \quad (39)$$

denote the pmf of the output $(\hat{X}_1^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n)$ from the channel $Q_{X_1 \dots X_h | A_{1,2} \dots A_{h-1,h}}$ when the codewords are selected uniformly randomly. Note that the expectation in (38) is only over the uniform selection of the codewords for a given realization of the codebook. Problem 1 aims to derive conditions on $(\mu_{1,2}^+, \mu_{1,2}^-, \dots, \mu_{h-1,h}^+, \mu_{h-1,h}^-)$ such that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n}^{(1)} \parallel Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}^{\otimes n}) \right] \right) = 0, \quad (40)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{m}^-} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{M}^-}^{(1)}(\cdot | \mathbf{m}^-) \parallel \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n}^{(1)}) \right]}{2^{n(\mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{h-1,h}^-)}} \right) = 0, \quad (41)$$

where $\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{M}^-}^{(1)}(\cdot | \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^-)$ is the conditional pmf of $\hat{X}_1^n$ given $\mathbf{M}^- = \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^-$, and equals

$$\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{M}^-}^{(1)}(\cdot | \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^-) \triangleq \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm : \mathbf{m}^- = \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^-} \frac{Q_{X_1 \dots X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{2^{n(\mu_{1,2}^+ + \dots + \mu_{h-1,h}^+)}}. \quad (42)$$

■

Note that Problem 1 relates to only A -codebooks, and poses two constraints:

- the constraint in (40) requires that the outputs be statistically indistinguishable from the outputs of DMS $Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}$, which is a natural constraint to impose for we would like to eventually translate a solution for the allied action-generation problem to one for the strong coordination problem; and
- the constraint in (41), though may seem unintuitive at the moment, is essential in translating the solution of the allied action-generation problem to one for the strong coordination problem. This constraint ensures that

$\mathbf{M}^- \triangleq (M_{1,2}^-, \dots, M_{h-1,h}^-)$ and $\hat{X}_1^n$ are (nearly) statistically independent. Later in this section, the scheme for strong coordination will equate $\mathbf{M}^-$ with the randomness common to all nodes, and since common randomness and the specified action are independent of one another, we must impose this constraint explicitly while designing the codebooks.

The following result provides a sufficient condition on the rates of the A -codebooks to meet the two constraints of Problem 1 given in (40) and (41).

Theorem 1: Suppose that the auxiliary RV codebooks are constructed using Steps **A1-A5**. For each $S \subseteq \mathcal{F} \triangleq \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, let $\mathcal{J}_S \triangleq \{(i, j) : \bar{\Phi}(i, j) \cap S \neq \emptyset\}$. Then, (40) is met provided for each $S \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $(1, h) \notin S$,

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{F} \setminus S} (\mu_s^+ + \mu_s^-) > I(X_1, \dots, X_h; A_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}), \quad (43)$$

and (41) is met provided for each $S \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $(1, h) \notin S$,

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{F} \setminus S} \mu_s^+ > I(X_1; A_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}). \quad (44)$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

While at first glance, it seems that $2^{\binom{h}{2}}$ rate conditions need to be met for Problem 1, as illustrated below, many equations can be redundant.

Remark 3: Consider the three hop-setting, i.e., $h = 4$. In this setting, the rate constraints imposed by (43) for $S = \{(1, 3)\}$, $\{(1, 2), (1, 3)\}$, $\{(1, 3), (2, 3)\}$ and $\{(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)\}$ are given by

$$\mu_{1,4}^+ + \mu_{1,4}^- + \mu_{2,4}^+ + \mu_{2,4}^- + \mu_{3,4}^+ + \mu_{3,4}^- + \mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^- + \mu_{2,3}^+ + \mu_{2,3}^- > I(\{X_j\}_{j=1}^4; A_{1,4}, A_{2,4}, A_{3,4}), \quad (45)$$

$$\mu_{1,4}^+ + \mu_{1,4}^- + \mu_{2,4}^+ + \mu_{2,4}^- + \mu_{3,4}^+ + \mu_{3,4}^- + \mu_{2,3}^+ + \mu_{2,3}^- > I(\{X_j\}_{j=1}^4; A_{1,4}, A_{2,4}, A_{3,4}), \quad (46)$$

$$\mu_{1,4}^+ + \mu_{1,4}^- + \mu_{2,4}^+ + \mu_{2,4}^- + \mu_{3,4}^+ + \mu_{3,4}^- + \mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^- > I(\{X_j\}_{j=1}^4; A_{1,4}, A_{2,4}, A_{3,4}), \quad (47)$$

$$\mu_{1,4}^+ + \mu_{1,4}^- + \mu_{2,4}^+ + \mu_{2,4}^- + \mu_{3,4}^+ + \mu_{3,4}^- > I(\{X_j\}_{j=1}^4; A_{1,4}, A_{2,4}, A_{3,4}). \quad (48)$$

Note that the last is the only non-trivial constraint, since the first three constraints are implied by it. ■

A simple application of Pinsker's and Jensen inequalities to (40) yields the following result.

Remark 4: When the rate constraints given by (43) are met, we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n}^{(1)} - Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}^{\otimes n} \right\|_1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \frac{Q_{X_1 \dots X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{\sum_{i,j:1 \leq i < j \leq h} n(\mu_{i,j}^+ + \mu_{i,j}^-)} - Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}^{\otimes n} \right\|_1 \quad (49)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{j=2}^h \frac{Q_{X_j X_{j-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{Q_{X_{j-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}}{2(n(\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + n(\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-))} - Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}^{\otimes n} \right\|_1 = 0, \quad (50)$$

where the expectation operator is over only the codebooks for $A_{i,j}$'s. ■

Thus, by choosing the rates of the codebooks for $A_{i,j}$'s satisfying the constraints of Theorem 1, we are guaranteed the existence of codebooks with which we can generate the h actions. At this point, it might seem that we are done with the generation of the h actions, and can proceed with identifying the indices used for codeword selection with the appropriate resources, and inverting the operation at Node 1. However, this is not the case since we have to devise a scheme that generates the actions in a *distributed* fashion (cf. Task 1 of Section IV, and Fig. 3). We do not yet have distributed generation of actions, i.e., the channel in Problem 1 of Fig. 6 does not decompose into h parallel channels, since

$$Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h | \mathbf{A}} = Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}} \prod_{i=2}^h Q_{X_i | \mathbf{A}, X_{i-1}}. \quad (51)$$

In order to decompose the channel $Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h | \mathbf{A}}$ into parallel channels, we need to use the B and C codebooks, and we do that via the following $h - 1$ subproblems.

Definition 4: For $i = 2, \dots, h$, Problem i pertains to the characterization of the rates corresponding to the codebooks for auxiliary RVs $B_{1,2}, \dots, B_{h-1,h}$ and $C_2, \dots, C_h$. Let for a given realization of all the codebooks, $i \in \{2, \dots, h\}$, and $\mathbf{m}^\pm \in \mathcal{M}_{1,2}^\pm \times \dots \times \mathcal{M}_{h-1,h}^\pm$,

$$\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n \hat{X}_i^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(\cdot) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm, l_i} Q_{X_{i-1} X_i | \mathbf{A} B_{i-1, i} C_i}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm), B_{i-1, i}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm), C_i^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm, l_i))}{2^{n(\kappa_{i-1}^+ + \kappa_{i-1}^- + \lambda_i)}} \quad (52)$$

denote the pmf of outputs $(\hat{X}_{i-1}^n, \hat{X}_i^n)$ conditioned on $\mathbf{A}^n = \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$ (i.e., when averaged over $B_{i-1, i}$ and C_i codewords corresponding to $\mathbf{M}^\pm = \mathbf{m}^\pm$ alone). Here, $Q_{X_{i-1} X_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}))$ is computed using the design p.m.f chosen in (12), and the realized codeword $\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$. Similarly, for $i \in \{2, \dots, h\}$, $\mathbf{m}^\pm \in \mathcal{M}_{1,2}^\pm \times \dots \times \mathcal{M}_{h-1,h}^\pm$ and $\mathbf{k}_{i-1}^- \in \mathcal{K}_{i-1}^-$, let

$$\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \mathbf{K}_{i-1}^-}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(\cdot | \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^-) \triangleq \frac{\sum_{(l_i, \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{i-1}^\pm) : \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{i-1}^- = \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^-} Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A} B_{i-1, i} C_i}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm), B_{i-1, i}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{i-1}^\pm), C_i^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{i-1}^\pm, l_i))}{2^{n(\kappa_{i-1}^+ + \lambda_i)}} \quad (53)$$

denote the conditional pmf of $\hat{X}_{i-1}^n$ conditioned on $\mathbf{A}^n = \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$ and $B_{i-1, i}^n = B_{i-1, i}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^\pm)$ (i.e., when averaged over $B_{i-1, i}$ and C_i codewords corresponding to $\mathbf{M}^\pm = \mathbf{m}^\pm$ and $\mathbf{K}_{i-1}^- = \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^-$ alone). Note that from (12), for $i = 2, \dots, h$, X_{i-1} is conditionally independent of C_i given $\mathbf{A}, B_{i-1}$. Hence, we also have the following:

$$\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \mathbf{K}_{i-1}^-}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(\cdot | \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^-) = \frac{\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{i-1}^\pm : \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{i-1}^- = \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^-} Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A} B_{i-1, i}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm), B_{i-1, i}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{i-1}^\pm))}{2^{n\kappa_{i-1}^+}}. \quad (54)$$

For $i = 2, \dots, h$, Problem i aims to derive conditions on $\kappa_{i-1}^+, \kappa_{i-1}^-, \lambda_i$ such that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n \hat{X}_i^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \parallel Q_{X_{i-1} X_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right) \right]}{2^{n(\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-)}} = 0. \quad (55)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^-} \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \mathbf{K}_{i-1}^-}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(\cdot | \mathbf{k}_{i-1}^-) \parallel Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right) \right]}{2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-) + \kappa_{i-1}^-)}} = 0. \quad (56)$$

Just like Problem 1, Problem i , $i = 2, \dots, h$, also poses two constraints, each of which is similar to the corresponding constraint in Problem 1.

- The first constraint enables us to approximate the conditional pmfs that appear within the product in (39) by conditional pmfs in (52) derived from outputs of suitable channel resolvability codes.
- The second constraint ensures for each $\mathbf{m}^\pm$ the action $\hat{X}_{i-1}^n$ generated by averaging over the $B_{i-1, i}$ and C_i codebooks is nearly independent of $\mathbf{K}_{i-1}^-$. Again, the need for this constraint will be manifest when we transform the scheme for the allied action-generation problem into a scheme for strong coordination, at which time, we will view $\mathbf{K}_{i-1}^-$ as a part of randomness common to all the nodes.

The following result characterizes sufficient conditions on the codebook rates for (55) and (56) to hold.

Theorem 2: Fix $i \in \{2, \dots, h\}$. Suppose that the auxiliary RV codebooks are constructed using **A1-A5**. Then, (55) is met provided the rates are chosen such that:

$$\kappa_{i-1}^+ + \kappa_{i-1}^- + \lambda_i > I(X_{i-1}, X_i; B_{i-1, i}, C_i | \mathbf{A}) \quad (57)$$

$$\kappa_{i-1}^+ + \kappa_{i-1}^- > I(X_{i-1}, X_i; B_{i-1, i} | \mathbf{A}), \quad (58)$$

and (56) is met provided:

$$\kappa_{i-1}^+ > I(X_{i-1}; B_{i-1, i} | \mathbf{A}). \quad (59)$$

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

Analogous to Remark 4, an application of Pinsker's and Jensen inequalities to (55) yields the following.

Remark 5: When the rate constraints (57)-(58) are met for each $i = 2, \dots, h$, we are guaranteed that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n \hat{X}_i^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{i-1} X_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1}{2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-))}} = 0, \quad (60)$$

where $\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n \hat{X}_i^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(i+1, \mathbf{m})}$ is defined in (52), and the outer $\mathbb{E}$ operator operates only over the codebooks for the auxiliary RVs $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}$. ■

We are now ready to combine together the solutions for the h problems to obtain a code for generating the h sources from the auxiliary RVs via their codebooks.

4) *A Solution for the Allied Action-generation Problem (Task 1):* Before we present the exact coding strategy, we first make use of the following result that enables replacing ideal conditional pmfs in the product term of (50) with those obtained from channel resolvability codes using the solutions to Problem i , $i = 2, \dots, h$.

Lemma 3: For the random codebook construction given in **A1-A5**, if the rate constraints given in Theorems 1 and 2 are met, then, in addition to (41), (50), (56), and (60), the following also holds.

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{x_1^n, \dots, x_h^n} \left| Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n, \dots, x_h^n) - \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \frac{Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{j=2}^h \frac{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n \hat{X}_j^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_{j-1}^n, x_j^n)}{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_{j-1}^n)}}{2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-))}} \right| \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (61)$$

Proof: See Appendix C. ■

Let us take a closer look at the subtracted term with the summation in (61). Suppose that the codebooks for the auxiliary RVs are constructed according to **A1-A5**. Let $\mathbf{M}^\pm \sim \text{unif} \left(\bigtimes_{1 \leq i < j \leq h} \mathcal{M}_{i,j}^\pm \right)$ be used to select codewords for $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}$ from the codebooks. Then, the following observations hold.

- $Q_{\hat{X}_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{M}^\pm))$ is the channel output when $\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{M}^\pm)$ is fed into the channel $Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}$. Note that by (12), $X_1 \leftrightarrow (A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{A}$. Hence, even though we use the channel $Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}$, it is effectively $Q_{X_1 | A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}}$, and hence it is only the codewords $A_{1,2}^m(\mathbf{M}^\pm), \dots, A_{1,h}^m(\mathbf{M}^\pm)$ that determine this distribution.
- Problem j , $j = 2, \dots, h$, induces a joint correlation between $\mathbf{M}^\pm$, $K_{j-1}^\pm$, L_j and actions at Node $j-1$ and j . Let $\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{M}^\pm, K_{j-1}^\pm, L_j, \hat{X}_{j-1}^n, \hat{X}_j^n}^{[j]}$ denote this joint pmf. Note that by the setup of Problem j (also see Fig. 6), we have

$$\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{M}^\pm, K_{j-1}^\pm, L_j}^{[j]} \sim \text{unif} \left(\left(\bigtimes_{1 \leq i < i' \leq h} \mathcal{M}_{i,i'}^\pm \right) \times \mathcal{K}_{j-1}^\pm \times \mathcal{L}_j \right). \quad (62)$$

Now, $Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \frac{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n \hat{X}_2^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(2, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_1^n, x_2^n)}{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(2, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_1^n)}$ is exactly the joint pmf of actions at Nodes 1 and 2 obtained by:

(a) setting the action for Node 1 as the channel output when $\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$ is fed into the channel $Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}$; (b) by generating an instance of $K_1^- \sim \text{unif}(\mathcal{K}_1^-)$ independently and using Node 1's action, the realized $\mathbf{M}^\pm$, and the generated K_1^- to select an instance of $K_1^+ \sim \hat{Q}_{K_1^+ | \hat{X}_1^n, \mathbf{M}^\pm, K_1^-}^{[2]}$; and finally (c) by generating an instance of $L_2 \sim \text{unif}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ independently, and then generating Node 2's action using the indices, and the conditional pmf $\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_2^n | \mathbf{M}^\pm, K_1^\pm, L_2}^{[2]}$ induced by Problem 2. Thus,

$$\frac{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n \hat{X}_2^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(2, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_1^n, x_2^n)}{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(2, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_1^n)} = \sum_{k_1^+, k_1^-, l_2} \frac{\hat{Q}_{K_1^+ | \hat{X}_1^n, \mathbf{M}^\pm, K_1^-}^{[2]}(k_1^+ | x_1^n, \mathbf{m}^\pm, k_1^-) \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_2^n | \mathbf{M}^\pm, K_1^\pm, L_2}^{[2]}(x_2^n | \mathbf{m}^\pm, k_1^\pm, l_2)}{|\mathcal{K}_1^-| |\mathcal{L}_2|}. \quad (63)$$

Since Problem j , $j > 2$ is similar in setup to Problem 2, we can also see that for $j = 3, \dots, h$,

$$\frac{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n \hat{X}_j^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_{j-1}^n, x_j^n)}{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(x_{j-1}^n)} = \sum_{k_{j-1}^\pm, l_j} \frac{\left(\hat{Q}_{K_{j-1}^+ | \hat{X}_{j-1}^n, \mathbf{M}^\pm, K_{j-1}^-}^{[j]}(k_{j-1}^+ | x_{j-1}^n, \mathbf{m}^\pm, k_{j-1}^-) \times \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_j^n | \mathbf{M}^\pm, K_{j-1}^\pm, L_j}^{[j]}(x_j^n | \mathbf{m}^\pm, k_{j-1}^\pm, l_j) \right)}{|\mathcal{K}_{j-1}^-| |\mathcal{L}_j|}. \quad (64)$$

- Piecing together the $h - 1$ conditional pmfs, we see that $Q_{X_1|A}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n | A^n(m^\pm)) \prod_{j=2}^h \frac{\widehat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n | A^n}^{(j, m^\pm)}(x_{j-1}^n, x_j^n)}{\widehat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n | A^n}^{(j, m^\pm)}(x_j^n)}$ is the joint pmf of the h actions that are generated when the first node's action is generated as described above, and all subsequent nodes use a procedure similar to above description for the second node but with the conditional pmfs derived from the corresponding problems.

Lastly, Lemma 3 presents the conditions for the joint pmf of the actions generated by the above scheme to be close to the target pmf, leading us to the following scheme for the allied action-generation problem.

- B1** Pick an auxiliary RV pmf meeting (12) with the additional choice that $C_i = X_i$, $i > 1$. Let $\{(\mu_{i,j}^+, \mu_{i,j}^-) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, $\{(\kappa_i^+, \kappa_i^-) : 1 \leq i < h\}$, and $\{\lambda_i : 1 < i \leq h\}$ satisfy (43), (44), and (57)-(59).
- B2** Generate codebooks for $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, $\{B_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$ and $\{C_i : 1 < i \leq h\}$ using Steps **A1-A5**.
- B3** Let for $i = 2, \dots, h$, $\widehat{Q}_{M^\pm, K_{i-1}^\pm, L_i, \hat{X}_{i-1}^n, \hat{X}_i^n}^{[i]}$ be the joint pmf induced by codebooks and actions induced by Problem i .
- B4** For $1 \leq i < j \leq h$ generate independent instances of RVs $M_{i,j}^\pm \sim \text{unif}([1, 2^{n\mu_{i,j}^+}] \times [1, 2^{n\mu_{i,j}^-}])$. Let $m^\pm$ be the realization of $M^\pm$.
- B5** Let $\hat{X}_1^n$ be the output of the channel $Q_{X_1|A}$ when the input to the channel is $A^n(m^\pm)$. Let $\hat{x}_1^n$ be the realization of $\hat{X}_1^n \sim Q_{X_1|A}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | A^n(m^\pm)) = Q_{X_1|A_{1,2} \dots A_{1,h}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | A_{1,2}(m^\pm) \dots A_{1,h}(m^\pm))$.
- B6** For $h > i \geq 1$, we repeat the following three steps in the given order.
- B7** Select $K_i^- \sim \text{unif}([1, 2^{n\kappa_i^-}])$ independently and let k_i^- be its realization. Generate an instance k_i^+ of $K_i^+ \in [1, 2^{n\kappa_i^+}]$ such that $K_i^+ \sim \widehat{Q}_{K_i^+ | \hat{X}_i^n, M^\pm, K_i^-}^{[i+1]}(\cdot | \hat{x}_i^n, m^\pm, k_i^-)$.
- B8** Let $L_{i+1} \sim \text{unif}([1, 2^{n\lambda_{i+1}}])$ and l_{i+1} be the realization of L_{i+1} .
- B9** Declare $\hat{X}_{i+1}^n \triangleq C_{i+1}^n(m^\pm, k_i^+, k_i^-, l_{i+1})$.

The following observations concerning the above scheme are now in order.

- Codewords for $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ are selected prior to the generation of any action, and in specific, the codewords for $\{A_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$ are selected prior to the generation of the h sources. However, the index and thereby the codeword for $B_{i,i+1}$ are selected *after* X_i^n is generated. This allows auxiliary RVs $B_{i,i+1}$ and $A_{i,i+1}$ to play distinct roles. The discussion at the end of Section IV-C sheds more light on the need for $B_{i,i+1}$.
- Selecting K_i^- independent of the realization of $\hat{X}_i^n$ at Step **B7** is possible only because of the fact that we have ensured that (56) holds by choosing rates that meet (59).
- RVs $M^\pm$, $\{K_i^\pm : 1 \leq i < h\}$ and $\{L_i : 2 \leq i \leq h\}$ are not independent. While $M^\pm$ and each $K_i^\pm$ are statistically independent, $M^\pm$, $K_i^\pm$ and $K_{i+1}^\pm$ together can possibly be dependent. This joint pmf is defined implicitly by the selection at Step **B7**.

We are now ready to state the achievable scheme for strong coordination using the scheme in **B1-B9** for the allied action-generation problem.

5) *A Scheme for Strong Coordination and the Resources Required (Task 2 and Task 3)*: Now that we have essentially completed the design of a scheme that generates the h actions, we are done with Task 1 described in Fig. 3. Before we present the details of Task 2 of Fig. 3 that relates to identifying the resources used for corresponding codebook rates, we detail Task 3 that relates to inverting the operation at Node 1 to generate the messages from the specified action. The strong coordination scheme derived from the above action-generation scheme is as follows.

- C1** Pick a pmf meeting (12) with the additional constraint that $C_i = X_i$ for $i > 1$. Let $\{(\mu_{i,j}^+, \mu_{i,j}^-) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, $\{(\kappa_i^+, \kappa_i^-) : 1 \leq i < h\}$, and $\{\lambda_i : 1 < i \leq h\}$ satisfy (43), (44), and (57)-(59).
- C2** Generate codebooks for $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, $\{B_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$ and $\{C_i : 1 < i \leq h\}$ using Steps **A1-A5**.
- C3** Let $\widehat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n, M^\pm}^{[1]}$ be the joint p.m.f induced by the codebooks in Problem 1 (see (42)). For $i = 2, \dots, h$, let $\widehat{Q}_{M^\pm, K_{i-1}^\pm, L_i, \hat{X}_{i-1}^n, \hat{X}_i^n}^{[i]}$ be the joint pmf induced by codebooks and actions in Problem i .
- C4** Generate an instance $(\{m_{i,j}^-\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq h}, \{k_i^-\}_{1 \leq i < h})$ of RVs $(\{M_{i,j}^-\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq h}, \{K_i^-\}_{1 \leq i < h})$ such that

$$(\{M_{i,j}^-\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq h}, \{K_i^-\}_{1 \leq i < h}) \sim \text{unif} \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq h} [1, 2^{n\mu_{i,j}^-}] \times \prod_{1 \leq i < h} [1, 2^{n\kappa_i^-}] \right). \quad (65)$$

These RVs are assumed to be extracted from the common randomness available to all nodes.

- C5** Generate an instance $\{m_{i,j}^+ : 2 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ of $\{M_{i,j}^+\}_{2 \leq i < j \leq h} \sim \text{unif} \left(\prod_{2 \leq i < j \leq h} [1, 2^{n\mu_{i,j}^+}] \right)$.
- C6** Given $X_1^n = x_1^n$, generate an instance of indices $(M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+)$ such that

$$(M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+) \sim \hat{Q}_{M_{1,2}^+ \dots M_{1,h}^+ | \hat{X}_1^n, M_{1,2}^-, \dots, M_{1,h}^-}^{[1]}(\cdot | x_1^n, m_{1,2}^-, \dots, m_{1,h}^-). \quad (66)$$

Let $\mathbf{m}^\pm$ be the instance of the realized and generated indices in Steps **C4-C6**.

- C7** For $i \geq 1$ we repeat the following three steps in the given order.
- C8** Generate a realization k_i^+ of $K_i^+ \in [1, 2^{n\kappa_i^+}]$ such that $K_i^+ \sim \hat{Q}_{K_i^+ | \hat{X}_i^n, M^\pm, K_i^-}^{[i+1]}(\cdot | \hat{x}_i^n, \mathbf{m}^\pm, k_i^-)$.
- C9** Node i forwards $\{m_{i',j'}^+ : i' \leq i < j' \leq h\}$, and k_i^+ to Node $i+1$.
- C10** Let l_{i+1} be a realization of $L_{i+1} \sim \text{unif}([1, 2^{n\lambda_{i+1}}])$ selected independent of all other RVs.
- C11** Declare $\hat{X}_{i+1}^n \triangleq C_{i+1}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm, k_i^+, k_i^-, l_{i+1})$.

What remains now is the task of associating the rates of the various indices to that of the resources (i.e., communication rates, and (local and common) randomness rates), which is the **Task 2** described in Fig. 3. Note that this association is dependent on the mode of intermediate node operation illustrated in Fig. 2. We first present the association for the functional and unrestricted cases, and then for the action-dependent mode. They are as follows.

(a) **Functional Mode:** In this mode, local randomness at each node (other than Node 1) is only used to generate the corresponding actions. This imposes two constraints:

1. since the generation of intermediate node actions uses local randomness, and since $B_{i,i+1}$, $i > 1$ generally depends on the action (see (12) and Step **C8**), $B_{i,i+1}$ has to be set as a constant RV. Since $B_{1,2}$ can be subsumed in $A_{1,2}$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $B_{1,2}$ is also a constant. Thus, $\kappa_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, h-1$; and
2. the randomness involved in determining the indices $\{M_{i,j}^+ : 1 < i < j \leq h\}$ in Step **C5** must come from either the incoming message or the common randomness. Consider $M_{i,j}^+$ for $1 < i < j$. If a part of randomness comes from communication from Node $i-1$ and a part from common randomness, it must be that Node $i-1$ is also aware of $M_{i,j}^+$. Thus, Node $i-1$ is also aware of the exact codeword chosen for $A_{i,j}$. Proceeding inductively, we can argue that Node 1 must be aware of the codeword selected for $A_{i,j}$. Thus, for each $j = 3, \dots, h$, we can embed auxiliary RVs $A_{2,j}, \dots, A_{j-1,j}$ into auxiliary RV $A_{1,j}$ without affecting the communication, local randomness or common randomness requirements. Thus, for $2 \leq i < j$, we can set $A_{i,j}$ as constant RVs, and $\mu_{i,j}^+ = \mu_{i,j}^- = 0$.

Thus, the only auxiliary RVs that remain in the system are $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}$ and $C_i = X_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, h$, and therefore we need to only assign resources for indices $M_{1,2}^+, M_{1,2}^-, \dots, M_{1,h}^+, M_{1,h}^-$ and $L_2, \dots, L_h$. Notice that common randomness is used to generate $M_{1,2}^-, \dots, M_{1,h}^-$ in Step **C4**, and hence,

$$R_c \triangleq \mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^-. \quad (67)$$

Indices $M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+$ are determined at Node 1 and for $\ell = 2, \dots, h$, $M_{1,\ell}^+$ is communicated to Node ℓ by hop-to-hop communication (see Step **C9**). Thus,

$$R_\ell \triangleq \mu_{1,\ell+1}^+ + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^+, \quad 1 \leq \ell < h. \quad (68)$$

Now to identify the rate of local randomness required at each node, notice that Nodes $2, \dots, h$ generate their actions using Step **C11**, which in turn requires $L_2, \dots, L_h$ to be generated in Step **C10**. Since these indices are not communicated, without loss of generality, we can assume that they are generated using local randomness in Step **C10**, and hence,

$$\rho_i \triangleq \lambda_i, \quad 1 < i \leq h. \quad (69)$$

Lastly, to identify the rate of local randomness required at Node 1, observe that the local randomness at Node 1, unlike other nodes, is not used to generate the action. Instead, it is used to select the codewords for $(A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h})$ by selecting $(M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+)$ at Step **C5**. The amount of local randomness required to make this selection is exactly quantified by Theorem 6 of Appendix D, and is given by:

$$\rho_1 \triangleq \sum_{j=2}^h \mu_{1,j}^+ - I(X_1; A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}). \quad (70)$$

A summary of the common and local randomness required to implement the various steps in the functional mode is presented in Table II.

TABLE II
ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES TO INDICES IN THE FUNCTIONAL MODE

Step	Operation	Codebook indices	Required randomness	Resource used for the operation
C4	Select indices for $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}$	$\{M_{1,j}^- : 1 < j \leq h\}$	$\mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^-$	R_c
C6	Generate indices for $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}$ at Node 1	$M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+$	$\sum_{j=2}^h \mu_{1,j}^+ - I(X_1; \{A_{1,\ell}\}_{\ell=2}^h)$	ρ_1
C10	For $2 \leq \ell \leq h$, select index for C_ℓ at Node ℓ	L_ℓ	λ_ℓ	ρ_ℓ

(b) **Unrestricted Mode:** Since there are no restrictions in this mode, we need to assign resources for indices $\{(M_{i,j}^+, M_{i,j}^-) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, $\{(K_i^+, K_i^-) : 1 \leq i < h\}$ and $L_2, \dots, L_h$. As before, in Step **C4**, the common randomness is used to select $\{M_{i,j}^- : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, $\{K_i^- : 1 \leq i < h\}$, and therefore,

$$R_c \triangleq (\kappa_1^- + \dots + \kappa_{h-1}^-) + \sum_{(i,j): 1 \leq i < j \leq h} \mu_{i,j}^-. \quad (71)$$

The communication requirements are determined in Step **C9**. For each $i = 1, \dots, h-1$ and $i < \ell \leq h$, index $M_{i,\ell}^+$ is determined by Node i and is forwarded by hop-by-hop communication over to Node ℓ . Further, for each $i = 1, \dots, h-1$, Node i also determines index K_i^+ and forwards it to Node $i+1$. Hence, the communication rate requirements between adjacent nodes are given by

$$R_i \triangleq \kappa_i^+ + \sum_{i',j': i' \leq i < j'} \mu_{i',j'}^+, \quad 1 \leq i < h. \quad (72)$$

Now, to determine the amount of local randomness at each node, we see that at Node 1 we need to use local randomness to generate indices $M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+$ and K_1^+ corresponding to auxiliary RVs $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}$ and $B_{1,2}$, respectively, using the given realization of X_1^n , and the common realization. The amount of local randomness required to generate these indices is quantified by Theorem 6 of Appendix D.

For $2 \leq i < h$, the local randomness required at Node i has three purposes: (1) to select messages $\{M_{i,j}^+ : j > i\}$, which requires a rate of $\mu_{i,j}^+$ (see **C5**); (2) to generate K_i^+ at Step **C8**, which requires a rate of $\kappa_i^+ - I(X_i; B_{i,i+1} | \mathbf{A})$ quantified by Theorem 7 of Appendix E; and lastly, (3) to generate L_i for use in generating the Node i 's action, which requires a rate λ_i . At Node h , local randomness is only needed to generate L_h to output action $\hat{X}_h^n$, which requires a rate λ_h specified in Step **C2**. Combining these arguments, we see that the rates of local randomness at nodes are given by:

$$\rho_\ell \triangleq \begin{cases} \sum_{j=2}^h \mu_{1,j}^+ + \kappa_1^+ - I(X_1; A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}, B_{1,2}), & \ell = 1 \\ \kappa_\ell^+ - I(X_\ell; B_{\ell,\ell+1} | \mathbf{A}) + \lambda_\ell + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^h \mu_{\ell,j}^+, & 1 < \ell < h \\ \lambda_h, & \ell = h \end{cases}. \quad (73)$$

A summary of the common and local randomness required to implement steps in the unrestricted mode is presented in Table III.

(c) **Action-dependent Mode:** In this mode, as in the case of the functional mode, an intermediate node's local randomness must be used only to generate the corresponding actions, but not to generate the next-hop messages (see Fig. 2). Therefore, the randomness required to implement Steps **C5** and **C8** must be extracted from either the incoming message and the common randomness. Since the incoming message itself cannot use the local randomness of the node that generated it, the randomness usable from the incoming message must indeed originate from Node 1. Thus, in this mode:

TABLE III
ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES TO INDICES IN THE UNRESTRICTED MODE

Step	Operation	Codebook indices	Required randomness	Resource used for the operation
C4	Select indices for $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ and $\{B_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$	$\{M_{i,j}^- : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ $\{K_i^- : 1 \leq i < h\}$	$\sum_{i,j:1 \leq i < j \leq h} \mu_{i,j}^- + \sum_{\ell=1}^{h-1} \kappa_\ell^-$	R_c
C5	For $1 < \ell < h$, select indices for $\{A_{\ell,j} : \ell < j \leq h\}$ at Node i	$\{M_{\ell,j}^+ : \ell < j \leq h\}$	$\sum_{j=\ell+1}^h \mu_{\ell,j}^+$	ρ_ℓ
C6	Generate indices for $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}$	$M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+$	$\sum_{j=2}^h \mu_{1,j}^+ - I(X_1; \{A_{1,\ell}\}_{\ell=2}^h)$	ρ_1
C8	For $1 \leq \ell < h$, generate indices for $B_{\ell,\ell+1}$ at Node ℓ	K_ℓ^+	$\kappa_\ell^+ - I(X_\ell; B_{\ell,\ell+1} \mathbf{A})$	ρ_ℓ
C10	For $2 \leq \ell \leq h$, select index for C_ℓ at Node ℓ	L_ℓ	λ_ℓ	ρ_ℓ

- we can, just as in the functional mode, embed auxiliary RVs $A_{2,3}, \dots, A_{h-1,h}$ into auxiliary RVs $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}$. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that for $1 < i < j \leq h$, $A_{i,j}$ is a constant RVs, and $\mu_{i,j}^+ = \mu_{i,j}^- = 0$.
- for $1 \leq \ell < h$, the randomness required for generating the index K_ℓ^+ at Node ℓ (during Step **C8**) is quantified by Theorem 7 of Appendix E to be $\kappa_\ell^+ - I(X_\ell; B_{\ell,\ell+1} | \mathbf{A})$. This randomness can be, without loss of generality, assumed to be obtained from Node 1's local randomness via hop-by-hop communication.

However, the amount of local and common randomness needed for the following three steps are identical to those needed in the unrestricted setting:

- in Step **C4** for selecting $\{M_{1,\ell}^+ : 1 < \ell \leq h\}$ and $\{K_i^+ : 1 \leq i < h\}$ at intermediate nodes;
- in Step **C6** for generating $\{M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+\}$ at Node 1 using the realized X_1^n ; and
- in Step **C10**: selecting $\{L_2, \dots, L_h\}$ at Nodes $2, \dots, h$.

Thus, the amount of common randomness required in this mode is given by

$$R_c \triangleq (\kappa_1^- + \dots + \kappa_{h-1}^-) + (\mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^-). \quad (74)$$

The indices to be communicated between Node i and Node $i+1$ include $\{M_{1,\ell} : i+1 \leq h\}$ and the part of Node 1's randomness used to implement Step **C8** at Node ℓ for $i+1 \leq h$. Hence,

$$R_i = \sum_{\ell \geq i+1} (\mu_{1,\ell}^+ + \kappa_\ell^+ - I(X_\ell; B_{\ell,\ell+1} | \mathbf{A})). \quad (75)$$

Lastly, since the local randomness of Nodes $2, \dots, h$ are used only to generate their respective actions,

$$\rho_i \triangleq \lambda_i, \quad i = 2, \dots, h. \quad (76)$$

However, the local randomness in Node 1 must be used to determine the indices $M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+$ in Step **C6**, and $K_1^+, \dots, K_{h-1}^+$ in Step **C8**. Hence,

$$\rho_1 \triangleq \sum_{j=2}^h \mu_{1,j}^+ - I(X_1; A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{h-1} (\kappa_\ell^+ - I(X_\ell; B_{\ell,\ell+1} | \mathbf{A})). \quad (77)$$

A summary of the common and local randomness required to implement various steps in the action-dependent mode is presented in Table IV.

6) *Inner Bound*: Now that we have completed the three steps, we can implicitly state the general inner bound to the capacity region that is achievable by the above scheme as follows.

- The portion of the capacity region achievable by the functional mode version of the above scheme is given by the conditions in (67)-(70) along with the rate-transfer arguments allowed by Lemma 2.
- The portion of the capacity region achievable by the action-dependent mode version of the above scheme is given by the conditions in (74)-(77) along with the rate-transfer arguments allowed by Lemma 2.
- In the unrestricted mode, an inner bound to the capacity region is given by the conditions in (71)-(73) along with the rate-transfer arguments allowed by Lemma 1.

TABLE IV
ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES TO INDICES IN THE ACTION-DEPENDENT MODE

Step	Operation	Codebook indices	Required randomness	Resource used for the operation
C4	Select indices for $\{A_{1,j} : 1 < j \leq h\}$ and $\{B_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$	$\{M_{i,j}^- : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ $\{K_i^- : 1 \leq i < h\}$	$\sum_{j:1 < j \leq h} \mu_{1,j}^- + \sum_{\ell=1}^{h-1} \kappa_\ell^-$	R_c
C6	Generate indices for $A_{1,2}, \dots, A_{1,h}$	$M_{1,2}^+, \dots, M_{1,h}^+$	$\sum_{j=2}^h \mu_{1,j}^+ - I(X_1; \{A_{1,\ell}\}_{\ell=2}^h)$	ρ_1
C8	For $1 \leq \ell < h$, generate indices for $B_{\ell,\ell+1}$ at Node ℓ	K_ℓ^+	$\kappa_\ell^+ - I(X_\ell; B_{\ell,\ell+1} \mathbf{A})$	ρ_1
C10	For $2 \leq \ell \leq h$, select index for C_ℓ at Node ℓ	L_ℓ	λ_ℓ	ρ_ℓ

B. Functional-mode Capacity Region

We begin this section with the capacity result characterizing the tradeoffs among common randomness, local randomness and communication rates to establish strong coordination using exclusively the functional mode of intermediate node operation.

Theorem 3: A rate point $(R_c, R_1, \dots, R_{h-1}, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_h)$ is achievable with the functional mode *if and only if* there exist auxiliary RVs $Z_2, \dots, Z_h$ jointly correlated with the actions according to pmf $Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h, Z_2, Z_3, \dots, Z_h}$ such that:

1. $Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h} = Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h};$
2. $Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h, Z_2, Z_3, \dots, Z_h} = Q_{Z_2, Z_3, \dots, Z_h} Q_{X_1 | Z_2, Z_3, \dots, Z_h} \prod_{\ell=2}^h Q_{X_\ell | Z_\ell, \dots, Z_h};$ and
3. for all $i = 1, \dots, h-1$,

$$R_i \geq I(X_1; Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_h), \quad (78)$$

$$R_c + R_i + \sum_{s \in S} \rho_s \geq I(\{X_l\}_{l=1}^h; \{Z_\ell\}_{\ell=i+1}^h) + H(X_S | \{Z_\ell\}_{\ell=i+1}^h), \quad S \subseteq \{i+1, \dots, h\}, \quad (79)$$

$$R_c + \rho_1 + \sum_{s \in T} \rho_s \geq I(X_2, \dots, X_h; Z_2, \dots, Z_h, X_T | X_1), \quad T \subseteq \{2, \dots, h\}. \quad (80)$$

Proof: We begin with the achievability part. Given $Q_{X_1 \dots X_h Z_2 Z_3 \dots Z_h}$, consider the achievable scheme of Section IV-A with the following choices:

$$A_{i,j} \triangleq \text{constant}, \quad 1 < i < j \leq h, \quad (81)$$

$$B_{i,i+1} \triangleq \text{constant}, \quad 1 \leq i < h, \quad (82)$$

$$A_{1,\ell} \triangleq Z_\ell, \quad 1 < \ell < h, \quad (83)$$

$$C_\ell \triangleq X_\ell, \quad 1 < \ell < h. \quad (84)$$

For this choice, the decomposition of (12) aligns with the decomposition in condition 2 of Theorem 3. Using the assignments (67)-(70) for the functional setting, we see that the following rate region is achievable.

$$R_c \geq \mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^-, \quad (85)$$

$$R_i \geq \mu_{1,i+1}^+ + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^+, \quad 1 \leq i < h, \quad (86)$$

$$\rho_i \geq \begin{cases} \mu_{1,2}^+ + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^+ - I(X_1; Z_2, \dots, Z_h) & i = 1 \\ H(X_i | Z_i, \dots, Z_h) & i > 1 \end{cases}, \quad (87)$$

where the code parameters $\mu_{1,2}^+, \dots, \mu_{1,h}^+, \mu_{1,2}^-, \dots, \mu_{1,h}^-$ can take non-negative values meeting the following conditions derived in Theorems 1 and 2:

$$\sum_{k=i}^h (\mu_{1,i}^+ + \mu_{1,i}^-) \geq I(X_1, \dots, X_h; Z_i, \dots, Z_h), \quad 1 < i \leq h, \quad (88)$$

$$\sum_{k=i}^h \mu_{1,i}^+ \geq I(X_1; Z_i, \dots, Z_h), \quad 1 < i \leq h. \quad (89)$$

Now, applying the rate-transfer arguments Lemma 2 to the above region, we see that the achievable region includes the following region.

$$R_c \geq \mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^- + \delta_1 + \dots + \delta_h, \quad (90)$$

$$R_i \geq \mu_{1,i+1}^+ + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^+ + \varepsilon_{i+1} + \dots + \varepsilon_h, \quad 1 \leq i < h, \quad (91)$$

$$\rho_1 \geq \mu_{1,2}^+ + \dots + \mu_{1,h}^+ - I(X_1; Z_2, \dots, Z_h) - \delta_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \dots + \varepsilon_h, \quad (92)$$

$$\rho_i \geq H(X_i | Z_i, \dots, Z_h) - \delta_i - \varepsilon_i, \quad 1 < i \leq h, \quad (93)$$

$$\sum_{k=i}^h (\mu_{1,i}^+ + \mu_{1,i}^-) \geq I(X_1, \dots, X_h; Z_i, \dots, Z_h), \quad 1 < i \leq h, \quad (94)$$

$$\sum_{k=i}^h \mu_{1,i}^+ \geq I(X_1; Z_i, \dots, Z_h), \quad 1 < i \leq h, \quad (95)$$

where in addition to the non-negativity constraints of the code parameters, we also impose

$$\delta_j \geq 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq h, \quad (96)$$

$$\varepsilon_j \geq 0, \quad 1 < j \leq h. \quad (97)$$

In the above, δ_i denotes the portion of common randomness that is used only by Node i as its local randomness (see the first rate-transfer condition of Lemma 2), and ε_i denotes the portion of local randomness of Node 1 that is communicated to Node i to be used as its local randomness (see the second rate-transfer condition of Lemma 2). Finally, an application of Fourier-Motzkin elimination to dispose of the code and rate-transfer parameters yields the required result.

Now, for the converse part, let $\mathbf{R} \triangleq (R_c, R_1, \dots, R_{h-1}, \rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_h)$ be achievable. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and an ε -code of length n operating at $\mathbf{R}$ that outputs $\hat{X}_i^n$ at Node i , $i > 1$. Then,

$$\|Q_{X_1}^{\otimes n} Q_{\hat{X}_2^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n | X_1^n} - Q_{X_1^n \dots X_h^n}^{\otimes n}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad (98)$$

For notational ease, denote $\hat{X}_1^n \triangleq X_1^n$. Since (98) holds, we infer from [16, Sec. V.A] that for any $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, h\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$,

$$H(\{\hat{X}_j^n\}_{j \in S}) \geq \sum_{k=1}^n H(\{\hat{X}_{j,k}\}_{j \in S}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon}, \quad (99)$$

$$H(\{\hat{X}_j^n\}_{j \in S} | \hat{X}_i^n) \geq \sum_{k=1}^n H(\{\hat{X}_{j,k}\}_{j \in S} | \hat{X}_{i,k}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon}, \quad (100)$$

for some $\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then, for any $i \in \llbracket 1, h-1 \rrbracket$,

$$nR_i \geq H(\mathbf{l}_i) \geq H(\mathbf{l}_i | \mathbf{M}_c) \quad (101)$$

$$\geq I(\hat{X}_1^n; \mathbf{l}_i | \mathbf{M}_c) \quad (102)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} I(\hat{X}_1^n; \mathbf{l}_i, \dots, \mathbf{l}_{h-1} | \mathbf{M}_c) \quad (103)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} I(\hat{X}_1^n; \mathbf{M}_c, \mathbf{l}_i, \dots, \mathbf{l}_{h-1}) \quad (104)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\hat{X}_{1,k}; \mathbf{M}_c, \{\mathbf{l}_j\}_{j=i}^{h-1}, \hat{X}_1^{k-1}) \quad (105)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\hat{X}_{1,k}; \{Z_{j,k}\}_{j=i+1}^h) \quad (106)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{=} nI(\hat{X}_{1,U}; \{Z_{j,U}\}_{j=i+1}^h | U) \quad (107)$$

$$\stackrel{(f)}{=} nI(\hat{X}_{1,U}; \{Z_j^*\}_{j=i+1}^h), \quad (108)$$

where

- (a) follows due to the functional mode of message generation;
- (b) because $\hat{X}_1^n = X_1^n$, and M_c are independent;
- (c) because $\hat{X}_1^n = X_1^n$ is i.i.d.;
- (d) by defining $Z_{j,k} \triangleq (M_c, l_{j-1}, \hat{X}_1^{k-1})$ for $2 \leq j \leq h$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$;
- (e) by defining time-sharing RV $U \sim \text{unif}([1, n])$; and
- (f) by setting $Z_j^* \triangleq (U, Z_{j,U})$ for $2 \leq j \leq h$, and since $\hat{X}_{1,U}$ and U are independent.

Lastly, note that by choice, the following Markov chains hold

$$\hat{X}_{1,U} \leftrightarrow \{Z_k^*\}_{k=2}^h \leftrightarrow (\hat{X}_{2,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{h,U}), \quad (109)$$

$$\hat{X}_{i,U} \leftrightarrow \{Z_k^*\}_{k=i}^h \leftrightarrow (\{Z_j^*\}_{j=2}^{i-1}, \{\hat{X}_{j,U} : j \neq i\}), \quad 1 < i \leq h. \quad (110)$$

Next, pick $i \in \{1, \dots, h-1\}$ and subset $S \subseteq [i+1, h]$. Now, consider the following argument.

$$n(R_c + R_i + \sum_{s \in S} \rho_s) \geq H(M_c, l_i, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}) \quad (111)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(M_c, l_i, \dots, l_{h-1}, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}, \{\hat{X}_s^n\}_{s \in S}) \quad (112)$$

$$\geq I(\hat{X}_1^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n; M_c, l_i, \dots, l_{h-1}, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}, \{\hat{X}_s^n\}_{s \in S}) \quad (113)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} I(\hat{X}_1^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n; M_c, l_i, \dots, l_{h-1}, \{\hat{X}_s^n\}_{s \in S}) \quad (114)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=1}^h; M_c, l_i, \dots, l_{h-1}, \{\hat{X}_\ell^{k-1}\}_{\ell=1}^h, \{\hat{X}_s^n\}_{s \in S}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (115)$$

$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \{Z_{j,k}\}_{j=i+1}^h, \{\hat{X}_{s,i}\}_{s \in S}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (116)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \{Z_{j,U}\}_{j=i+1}^h, \{\hat{X}_{s,U}\}_{s \in S} | U) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (117)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \{Z_j^*\}_{j=i+1}^h, \{\hat{X}_{s,U}\}_{s \in S}) - n\delta''_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (118)$$

$$= nH(\{\hat{X}_{s,U}\}_{s \in S}) + nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \{Z_j^*\}_{j=i+1}^h | \{\hat{X}_{s,U}\}_{s \in S}) - n\delta''_{n,\varepsilon}, \quad (119)$$

where

- (a) follows due to functional mode of message generation, and because $H(\hat{X}_j^n | M_c, l_{j-1}, M_{L_j}) = 0$ for $j > 1$;
- (b) follows by dropping $\{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}$ from the mutual information term;
- (c) uses the chain rule, and then (99) to get rid of the conditioning;
- (d) follows by introducing the uniform time-sharing RV U ; and lastly,
- (e) follows by defining $\delta''_{n,\varepsilon} \triangleq \delta'_{n,\varepsilon} + I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; U)$, and by noting that (98) ensures that $(\hat{X}_1^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n)$ are nearly i.i.d., which then implies that

$$I(\hat{X}_{1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{1,U}; U) = H(\hat{X}_{1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{1,U}) - H(\hat{X}_{1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{1,U} | U) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0. \quad (120)$$

Next, consider the following argument for $S \subseteq \{2, \dots, h\}$.

$$n(R_c + \rho_1 + \sum_{s \in S} \rho_s) \geq H(M_c, M_{L_1}, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}) \quad (121)$$

$$\geq I(\hat{X}_1^n, \dots, \hat{X}_h^n; M_c, M_{L_1}, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}) \quad (122)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=2}^h; M_c, M_{L_1}, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S} | \hat{X}_1^n) \quad (123)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=2}^h; M_c, M_{L_1}, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}, \{l_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{h-1} | \hat{X}_1^n) \quad (124)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=2}^h; M_c, M_{L_1}, \{M_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}, \{l_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{h-1}, \{\hat{X}_s^n\}_{s \in S} | \hat{X}_1^n) \quad (125)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=2}^h; \mathbf{M}_c, \mathbf{M}_{L_1}, \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{h-1}, \{\hat{X}_s^n\}_{s \in S}, \{\hat{X}_\ell^{k-1}\}_{\ell=1}^h, \hat{X}_1^n | \hat{X}_{1,k}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (126)$$

$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \mathbf{M}_c, \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{h-1}, \{\hat{X}_{s,k}\}_{s \in S}, \hat{X}_1^{k-1} | \hat{X}_{1,k}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (127)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \{Z_{j,k}\}_{j=2}^h, \{\hat{X}_{s,k}^n\}_{s \in S} | \hat{X}_{1,k}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (128)$$

$$\stackrel{(f)}{\geq} nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \{Z_{j,U}\}_{j=2}^h, \{\hat{X}_{s,U}^n\}_{s \in S} | \hat{X}_{1,U}, U) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (129)$$

$$\stackrel{(g)}{\geq} nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; \{Z_j^*\}_{j=2}^h, \{\hat{X}_{s,U}^n\}_{s \in S} | \hat{X}_{1,U}) - n\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon}, \quad (130)$$

where

- (a) follows because common and local randomness are independent of the action specified at Node 1;
- (b) holds since $\mathbf{l}_1$ is a function of $(\mathbf{M}_c, \mathbf{M}_{L_1}, \hat{X}_1^n)$, and due to the functional mode of operation at other nodes;
- (c) follows because $H(\hat{X}_j^n | \mathbf{M}_c, \mathbf{M}_{L_j}, \mathbf{l}_{j-1}) = 0$ for $j = 2, \dots, h$;
- (d) uses the chain rule, then drops $\{\mathbf{M}_{L_s}\}_{s \in S}$, and lastly employs (100) to get rid of the conditioning;
- (e) follows by introducing the auxiliary RVs defined earlier;
- (f) follows by introducing the uniform time-sharing RV U ; and lastly,
- (g) follows by defining $\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon} \triangleq \delta'_{n,\varepsilon} + I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; U | \hat{X}_{1,U})$, and from (120), we see that

$$I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; U | \hat{X}_{1,U}) \leq I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=1}^h; U) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0. \quad (131)$$

Lastly, note that since we have the correct structure for the auxiliary RVs, we can restrict their cardinalities using Carathéodory's theorem. The proof is then complete by limiting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and by invoking the continuity of the information functional, the compactness of the space of joint pmfs of the actions and the auxiliary RVs, and the facts that $\delta''_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ and $\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$. ■

Remark 6: Unlike usual source-coding outer-bound proofs, the joint pmf of $(\hat{X}_{1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{h,U})$ depends on ε . However, $\|Q_{\hat{X}_{1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{h,U}} - Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h}\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. ■

The above result automatically yields the tradeoffs between common randomness rate and communication rates when local randomness is absent at Nodes $2, \dots, h$, since in this setting, the only mode intermediate nodes can operate in is the functional mode. Both the achievability and the converse arguments of Theorem 3 can be modified appropriately to show the following.

Remark 7: When $\rho_2 = \dots = \rho_h = 0$, the tradeoffs between common randomness rate and the rates of communication are given by:

$$R_\ell \geq I(X_1; X_{\ell+1}, \dots, X_h), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, h-1, \quad (132)$$

$$R_c + R_\ell \geq H(X_{\ell+1}, \dots, X_h), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, h-1, \quad (133)$$

$$R_c + \rho_1 \geq H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1). \quad (134)$$

We conclude this section with the following result that argues that when the common randomness shared by all the nodes is sufficiently large, it is sufficient to focus on strong coordination schemes where intermediate nodes operate in the functional mode. Hence, the tradeoffs defined by Theorem 3 approximate the strong coordination capacity region at large rates of common randomness.

Theorem 4: Suppose that the rate of common randomness available to all nodes is sufficiently large, i.e., $R_c > H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1)$. Then, the requirements for local randomness rates and communication rates are decoupled, and are given by:

$$\rho_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, h, \quad (135)$$

$$R_i \geq I(X_1; X_{i+1}, \dots, X_h), \quad i = 1, \dots, h-1. \quad (136)$$

Further, in this setting, it suffices to focus on functional schemes alone.

Proof: For the achievability, consider the functional scheme of Theorem 3 with the following choices:

$$A_{1,i} = X_i, \quad i = 2, \dots, h, \quad (137)$$

$$\mu_{1,i}^+ = \begin{cases} I(X_1; X_i | X_{i+1}, \dots, X_h), & i = 2, \dots, h-1 \\ I(X_1; X_h), & i = h \end{cases}, \quad (138)$$

$$\mu_{1,i}^- = H(X_i | X_{i+1}, \dots, X_h, X_1), \quad i = 2, \dots, h. \quad (139)$$

For this achievable scheme, we see from (67) and (68) that the rate of common randomness required is $\sum_{i=2}^h \mu_{1,i}^- = H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1)$, and the communication rate between Node i and Node $i+1$ is $I(X_1; X_{i+1}, \dots, X_h)$. Further, for this choice, we do not require that Nodes $1, \dots, h$ possess any local randomness, thus establishing the achievability of the region claimed.

The optimality of this scheme is evident from the cut-set argument that for $1 \leq i < h$, the rate between Node i and Node $i+1$ can be no smaller than the smallest rate in a one-hop network where the first node is specified the action X_1^n and the second node requires the action $(X_{i+1}^n, \dots, X_h^n)$. For the one-hop network, the smallest rate of communication is given by [3, Theorem 10], and equals $I(X_1; X_{i+1}, \dots, X_h)$. ■

C. Markov Actions

In this section, we study the specific setting where the set of h actions for a Markov chain that is aligned with the network topology, i.e., we have

$$X_1 \leftrightarrow X_2 \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow X_{h-1} \leftrightarrow X_h. \quad (140)$$

For this specific class of actions, while we do not have a complete characterization of the optimal tradeoffs among the common and local randomness required at the node nodes and the communication rates on the links, we derive two partial characterizations that correspond to the two extreme cases of common randomness rates. More specifically, we quantify the required rates of local randomness and the communication rates on each link of the network when:

- (a) common randomness is *sufficiently large*, i.e., $R_c > H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1)$; and
- (b) common randomness is absent;

The first setting when the common randomness is sufficiently large is a direct consequence of Theorem 4, and the corresponding result for Markov actions is as follows.

Remark 8: The requirements on local randomness rates and communication rates when the rate of common randomness available to all nodes is $R_c > H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1)$ are given by:

$$\rho_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, h, \quad (141)$$

$$R_i \geq I(X_1; X_{i+1}), \quad i = 1, \dots, h-1. \quad (142)$$

Further, it suffices to use functional schemes to achieve the above lower bounds. ■

The main result in this section is the following result characterizing the trade-offs when there is no common randomness.

Theorem 5: Strong coordination is achievable at local randomness rates $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_h)$ and communication rates $(R_1, \dots, R_{h-1})$ and zero common randomness rate (i.e., in the absence of common randomness) provided there exist auxiliary RVs $Z_1, \dots, Z_{h-1}$ such that

$$X_1 \leftrightarrow Z_1 \leftrightarrow X_2 \leftrightarrow Z_2 \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow X_{h-1} \leftrightarrow Z_{h-1} \leftrightarrow X_h, \quad (143)$$

and for each $1 \leq i \leq j \leq h$,

$$R_i + \sum_{k=i+1}^j \rho_k \geq \begin{cases} I(X_i, X_{i+1}; Z_i), & i = j < h \\ H(X_{i+1}, \dots, X_j | X_i) + I(X_i; Z_i) + I(X_{j+1}; Z_j | X_j), & i < j < h \\ H(X_{i+1}, \dots, X_h | X_i) + I(X_i; Z_i), & i < j = h \\ I(X_h; Z_h), & i = j = h \end{cases}, \quad (144)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^j \rho_k \geq \begin{cases} I(X_2; Z_1 | X_1), & j = 1 \\ H(X_2, \dots, X_j | X_1) + I(X_{j+1}; Z_j | X_j), & 1 < j < h \\ H(X_2, \dots, X_h | X_1), & j = h \end{cases}. \quad (145)$$

Proof: For the achievable part of the proof, pick $Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h, Z_1, \dots, Z_{h-1}}$ such that the above Markov chain holds, and $Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h} = Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h}$. To build a code using this joint pmf, we adapt the code design of Section IV-A with the following assignments:

$$A_{i,j} \triangleq \text{constant}, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq h, \quad (146)$$

$$B_{i,i+1} \triangleq Z_i, \quad 1 \leq i < h, \quad (147)$$

$$C_i \triangleq X_i, \quad 1 < i \leq h. \quad (148)$$

such that the joint pmf of actions and the auxiliary RVs are:

$$Q_{X_1} Q_{B_{1,2}|X_1} \prod_{j=2}^h (Q_{C_j|B_{j-1},j} Q_{X_j|B_{j-1},j} Q_{C_j} Q_{B_{j,j+1}|X_j}), \quad (149)$$

with $Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h} = Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h}$. Note that this assignment meets the decomposition specified in (12). Now, from the analysis in Section IV-A, and specifically from Theorem 2 we see that we can build a strong coordination code with the following codebook parameters.

$$(\mu_{i,j}^+, \mu_{i,j}^-) \triangleq (0, 0), \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq h, \quad (150)$$

$$(\kappa_i^+, \kappa_i^-) \triangleq (I(X_i X_{i+1}; B_{i,i+1}), 0) = (I(X_i X_{i+1}; Z_i), 0), \quad 1 \leq i < h, \quad (151)$$

$$\lambda_i \triangleq I(X_{i-1}, X_i; C_i | B_{i-1,i}) = H(X_i | Z_{i-1}), \quad 1 < i \leq h. \quad (152)$$

Now, using the assignments (for the unrestricted mode of intermediate-node operation) in Section IV-A5, we infer that a code can be built with the following common, local and communication rates.

$$R_c \triangleq 0, \quad (153)$$

$$\rho_j \triangleq \begin{cases} I(X_2; Z_1 | X_1), & j = 1 \\ I(X_{j+1}; Z_j | X_j) + H(X_j | Z_{j-1}), & 1 < j < h \\ H(X_h | Z_{h-1}), & j = h \end{cases}, \quad (154)$$

$$R_j \triangleq I(X_j, X_{j+1}; Z_j), \quad 1 \leq j < h. \quad (155)$$

Since the rate-transfer from ρ_j to ρ_{j-1} is allowable by communicating local randomness from Node $j - 1$ to Node j (Lemma 1), we see that the following randomness and communication rates also suffice to achieve strong coordination.

$$R_c \triangleq 0, \quad (156)$$

$$\rho_j \triangleq \begin{cases} I(X_2; Z_1 | X_1) + \delta_2, & j = 1 \\ I(X_{j+1}; Z_j | X_j) + H(X_j | Z_{j-1}) - \delta_j + \delta_{j+1}, & 1 < j < h \\ H(X_h | Z_{h-1}) - \delta_j, & j = h \end{cases}, \quad (157)$$

$$R_j \triangleq I(X_j, X_{j+1}; Z_j) + \delta_j, \quad 1 \leq j < h, \quad (158)$$

where the rate-transfer variables δ_i 's are subject to non-negativity constraints. A routine Fourier-Motzkin elimination to dispose of the rate-transfer variables yields the requisite rate region.

Now, to prove the converse, suppose that there exists a scheme requiring a local randomness rate of $\rho_i + \varepsilon$ at Node i and a communication rate of $R_i + \varepsilon$ from Node i to Node $i + 1$ such that the joint pmf of the actions given the first node's action satisfies

$$\|Q_{\hat{X}_1^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n} - Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}^{\otimes n}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \quad (159)$$

where we let $\hat{X}_1^n = X_1^n$ to be the action specified at Node 1. Then, for any $1 \leq j < h$,

$$n \sum_{k=1}^j \rho_k \geq H(M_{L_1}, \dots, M_{L_j}) \quad (160)$$

$$\geq H(M_{L_1}, \dots, M_{L_j} | \hat{X}_1^n) \quad (161)$$

$$\geq I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; \{M_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^j | \hat{X}_1^n) \quad (162)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^j | \hat{X}_1^n) \quad (163)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^j | \hat{X}_1^n, \{\hat{X}_\ell^{k-1}\}_{\ell=2}^j) \quad (164)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_1^n, \{\hat{X}_\ell^{k-1}\}_{\ell=2}^j) \quad (165)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=2}^j, \hat{X}_1^n, \{\hat{X}_\ell^{k-1}\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1} | \hat{X}_{1,k}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (166)$$

$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; \mathbf{l}_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_{1,k}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (167)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{k=1}^n I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; Y_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_{1,k}) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (168)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{=} nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; Y_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_{1,U}, U) - n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (169)$$

$$\stackrel{(f)}{\geq} nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}^n\}_{\ell=2}^{j+1}; \bar{Y}_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_{1,U}) - n\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (170)$$

$$= nH(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}^n\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_{1,U}) + nI(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \bar{Y}_j | \{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}^n\}_{\ell=1}^j) - n\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (171)$$

$$\stackrel{(g)}{=} nH(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}^n\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_{1,U}) + nI(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \bar{Y}_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}^n\}_{\ell=1}^{j-1} | \hat{X}_{j,U}) - n\bar{\delta}_{j,n,\varepsilon} \quad (172)$$

$$\geq nH(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}^n\}_{\ell=2}^j | \hat{X}_{1,U}) + nI(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \bar{Y}_j | \hat{X}_{j,U}) - n\bar{\delta}_{j,n,\varepsilon}, \quad (173)$$

where

- (a) follows because in the absence of common randomness, $\mathbf{l}_1$ is a function of X_1^n and $\mathbf{M}_{L_1}$, and for $i = 2, \dots, j$, $\mathbf{l}_j$ is a function of $\mathbf{l}_{j-1}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{L_j}$;
- (b) follows from two steps: 1) introducing action variables $\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=2}^j$, since they are functions of $\{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{j-1}$ and $\{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=2}^j$; and then 2) by dropping $\{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=2}^j$;
- (c) follows from (100), since the actions are nearly i.i.d.;
- (d) by defining $Y_j \triangleq \mathbf{l}_j$;
- (e) by introducing a time-sharing variable U that is uniform over $\{1, \dots, n\}$;
- (f) from by setting $\bar{Y}_j \triangleq (Y_j, U)$ and defining

$$\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon} \triangleq \delta'_{n,\varepsilon} + I(\hat{X}_{2,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{h,U}; U | X_{1,U}), \quad (174)$$

which due to (131), is guaranteed to vanish as we let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$; and finally,

- (g) follows by defining for $j = 1, \dots, h-1$,

$$\bar{\delta}_{j,n,\varepsilon} \triangleq \tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon} + I(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \hat{X}_{1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{j-1,U} | \hat{X}_{j,U}), \quad (175)$$

which, due to the Markovity of the actions (140) and Remark 6, is also guaranteed to vanish as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

While this establishes (145) for $j < h$, the argument for when $j = h$ follows from the above by setting $\mathbf{l}_h$ and Y_h as constant RVs.

Now, to prove (144), we proceed as follows. Let $1 \leq i \leq j < h$. Then,

$$n \left(R_i + \sum_{k=i+1}^j \rho_k \right) \geq H(\mathbf{l}_i, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j) \quad (176)$$

$$\geq H(\{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=i}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j) \quad (177)$$

$$\geq I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=i}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j) \quad (178)$$

$$\geq I(\hat{X}_i^n; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=i}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j) + I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=i}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_i^n) \quad (179)$$

$$\geq I(\hat{X}_i^n; \mathbf{l}_i) + I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=i}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_i^n) \quad (180)$$

$$= I(\hat{X}_i^n; \mathbf{l}_i) + I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}; \{\mathbf{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=i}^j, \{\mathbf{M}_{L_\ell}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j, \{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_i^n) \quad (181)$$

$$\geq I(\hat{X}_i^n; \mathbf{l}_i) + I(\{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}; \mathbf{l}_j, \{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_i^n) \quad (182)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n \left(I(\hat{X}_{i,k}; \mathbf{l}_i | \hat{X}_i^{k-1}) + I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}; \mathbf{l}_j, \{\hat{X}_\ell^n\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_i^n, \{\hat{X}_\ell^{k-1}\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}) \right) \quad (183)$$

$$\stackrel{(99),(100)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(I(\hat{X}_{i,k}; \mathbf{l}_i) + I(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}; \mathbf{l}_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,k}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_{i,k}) \right) - 2n\delta'_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (184)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} nI(\hat{X}_{i,U}; \bar{Y}_i) + nI(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=i+1}^{j+1}; \bar{Y}_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_{i,U}) - 2n\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon} \quad (185)$$

$$= nI(\hat{X}_{i,U}; \bar{Y}_i) + nH(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_{i,U}) + nI(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \bar{Y}_j | \{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=i}^j) - 2n\tilde{\delta}_{n,\varepsilon},$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} n(I(\hat{X}_{i,U}; \bar{Y}_i) + H(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_{i,U}) + I(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \bar{Y}_j, \{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=i}^{j-1} | \hat{X}_{j,U}) - 2\bar{\delta}_{j,n,\varepsilon}) \quad (186)$$

$$\geq n(I(\hat{X}_{i,U}; \bar{Y}_i) + H(\{\hat{X}_{\ell,U}\}_{\ell=i+1}^j | \hat{X}_{i,U}) + I(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \bar{Y}_j | \hat{X}_{j,U}) - 2\bar{\delta}_{j,n,\varepsilon}), \quad (187)$$

where:

(a) follows from a time-sharing argument with auxiliary RVs $\{\bar{Y}_j : 1 \leq j < h\}$ defined previously; and

(b) follows by the use of $\bar{\delta}_{j,n,\varepsilon}$ defined in (175).

Also, as before, the proof of (144) for $j = h$ follows by setting $\mathbf{l}_h$ and Y_h as constants.

We are left to establish one last fact, which is the Markov condition to be met by the actions and the auxiliary RVs. Note that as per the definitions of the auxiliary RVs, we do not have the chain $X_1 \leftrightarrow \bar{Y}_1 \leftrightarrow X_2 \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow \bar{Y}_{h-1} \leftrightarrow X_h$. This follows from the fact that our choice of the auxiliary RV $\bar{Y}_j = \mathbf{l}_j$ ensures that we have conditional independence of actions at adjacent nodes given the message communicated over the hop connecting the two nodes (i.e., $X_{j,U} \leftrightarrow \bar{Y}_j \leftrightarrow X_{j+1,U}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, h-1$); however, we do not have conditional independence of messages conveyed on adjacent hops conditioned on the action of the node in-between (i.e., we do not have $\bar{Y}_j \leftrightarrow X_{j+1,U} \leftrightarrow \bar{Y}_{j+1}$). Note however that the information functionals in (144) and (145) only contain one auxiliary RV. Hence, it is possible to define a new set of auxiliary RVs that would both satisfy the long chain in the claim and preserve the information functionals. To do so, define RVs $\tilde{X}_k$, $k = 1, \dots, h$, and Z_j , $j = 1, \dots, h-1$, such that their joint pmf is given by

$$Q_{\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_h} \triangleq Q_{\hat{X}_{1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{h,U}}, \quad (188)$$

$$Q_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{h-1} | \tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_h}(z_1, \dots, z_{h-1} | x_1, \dots, x_h) \triangleq \prod_{j=1}^{h-1} Q_{\bar{Y}_j | \hat{X}_{j,U}, \hat{X}_{j+1,U}}(z_j | x_j, x_{j+1}). \quad (189)$$

Note that we have $\tilde{X}_1 \leftrightarrow Z_1 \leftrightarrow \tilde{X}_2 \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow Z_{h-1} \leftrightarrow \tilde{X}_h$, and further for $1 \leq i < j \leq h$,

$$H(\tilde{X}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_j | \tilde{X}_i) = H(\hat{X}_{i+1,U}, \dots, \hat{X}_{j,U} | \hat{X}_{i,U}), \quad (190)$$

$$I(\tilde{X}_{j+1}; Z_j | \tilde{X}_j) = I(\hat{X}_{j+1,U}; \bar{Y}_j | \hat{X}_{j,U}), \quad (191)$$

$$I(\tilde{X}_j; Z_j) = I(\hat{X}_{j,U}; \bar{Y}_j). \quad (192)$$

The proof is completed by limiting the size of the auxiliary RVs $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^{h-1}$, and then by limiting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, which ensures that $Q_{\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_h} \rightarrow Q_{X_1, \dots, X_h}$, and each of infinitesimals in $\{\delta_{j,n,\varepsilon} : 1 \leq j < h\}$ vanishes. ■

We conclude this section with a short discussion on the indispensability of auxiliary RVs $\{B_{i,i+1} : i = 1, \dots, h-1\}$ using the above result.

D. The essentiality of $\{B_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$

The auxiliary RVs $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ have a natural purpose – Node i uses $A_{i,j}$ to coordinate its actions with that of Node j . However, the need for $\{B_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i < h\}$ is technical, and arises from the fact that not all joint pmfs for $\{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$ can be realized as a coding scheme. For example, their joint pmf must satisfy the chains in (8). For simplicity, let's focus on the following setting. Let random variables V_1 and V_2 be jointly correlated according to Q_{V_1, V_2} that has full support and suppose that $I(V_1; V_2) > 0$. Let us focus on strong

coordination on a line network with $h = 3$ nodes, where actions $X_1 = V_1$, $X_2 = (V_1, V_2)$, and $X_3 = V_2$. Let us focus on the setting where there is no common information, and each node has sufficient local randomness, say $\rho_i > H(V_1, V_2)$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. Since, we have $X_1 \leftrightarrow X_2 \leftrightarrow X_3$, we can see that the rates for communication required for strong coordination specified by Theorem 5 are as follows.

$$R_i \geq H(V_i), \quad i \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (193)$$

An achievable code for the corner point of the above region can be constructed by setting $A_{1,2} = A_{1,3} = A_{2,3} = \text{constant}$, and by choosing $B_{1,2} = X_1 = V_1$ and $B_{2,3} = V_2 = X_3$. We will now show that it is impossible to attain the corner point $(R_1, R_2) = H(V_1, V_2)$ by use of only $A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}$.

Using the rate expressions for the unrestricted mode of operation at Node 2 given in Section IV-A5, we see that we can build a code with common randomness rate $R_c = 0$, local randomness rates $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho_3 = H(V_1, V_2)$, and communication rates $R_1 = H(V_1)$ and $R_2 = H(V_2)$ with only auxiliary RVs $A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}$ if there exists a joint pmf $Q_{X_1 X_2 X_3 A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}}$ such that

$$A_{1,2} \leftrightarrow A_{1,3} \leftrightarrow A_{2,3}, \quad (194)$$

$$V_1 = X_1 \leftrightarrow (A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}) \leftrightarrow (X_2, X_3) = (V_1, V_2), \quad (195)$$

$$V_2 = X_3 \leftrightarrow (A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}) \leftrightarrow (X_1, X_2) = (V_1, V_2). \quad (196)$$

provided the codebook rates satisfy the following conditions imposed by the unrestricted mode of operation and by Theorems 1 and 2.

$$R_c \stackrel{(71)}{=} \mu_{1,2}^- + \mu_{2,3}^- + \mu_{1,3}^- = 0, \quad (197)$$

$$R_1 \stackrel{(72)}{=} \mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,3}^+ = H(V_1), \quad (198)$$

$$R_2 \stackrel{(72)}{=} \mu_{2,3}^+ + \mu_{1,3}^+ = H(V_2), \quad (199)$$

$$\mu_{1,3}^+ \geq I(X_1, X_2, X_3; A_{1,3}) = I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,3}), \quad (200)$$

$$\mu_{1,3}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^+ \geq I(X_1, X_2, X_3; A_{1,3}) = I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}), \quad (201)$$

$$\mu_{1,3}^+ + \mu_{2,3}^+ \geq I(X_1, X_2, X_3; A_{1,3}) = I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}), \quad (202)$$

$$\mu_{1,3}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{2,3}^+ \geq I(X_1, X_2, X_3; A_{1,3}) = I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}). \quad (203)$$

Then, it must be true that

$$I(V_2; A_{1,3}|V_1) = 0, \quad (204)$$

since

$$I(V_2; A_{1,2} A_{1,3}|V_1) = I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,2} A_{1,3}|V_1) - H(V_1) \stackrel{(195)}{=} I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,2} A_{1,3}) - H(V_1) \quad (205)$$

$$\stackrel{(201)}{\leq} R_1 - H(V_1) = 0. \quad (206)$$

Similarly, $I(V_1; A_{1,3}|V_2) = 0$, since

$$I(V_1; A_{1,3} A_{2,3}|V_2) = I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,3} A_{2,3}|V_2) - H(V_2) \stackrel{(196)}{=} I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,3} A_{2,3}) - H(V_2) \quad (207)$$

$$\stackrel{(202)}{\leq} R_2 - H(V_2) = 0. \quad (208)$$

Thus, we have $A_{1,3} \leftrightarrow V_1 \leftrightarrow V_2$ and $V_1 \leftrightarrow V_2 \leftrightarrow A_{1,3}$. Since Q_{V_1, V_2} has full support, it follows that for any $(a_{1,3}, v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,3} \times \mathcal{V}_1 \times \mathcal{V}_2$, we have

$$Q_{A_{1,3}|V_1}(a_{1,3}|v_1) = \frac{Q_{A_{1,3} V_1 V_2}(a_{1,3}, v_1, v_2)}{Q_{V_1 V_2}(v_1, v_2)} = Q_{A_{1,3}|V_2}(a_{1,3}|v_2). \quad (209)$$

Hence, for any $(a_{1,3}, v_1) \in \mathcal{A}_{1,3} \times \mathcal{V}_1$,

$$Q_{A_{1,3}|V_1}(a_{1,3}|v_1) = \sum_{v_2} Q_{A_{1,3}|V_1}(a_{1,3}|v_1) Q_{V_2}(v_2) \stackrel{(209)}{=} \sum_{v_2} Q_{A_{1,3}|V_2}(a_{1,3}|v_2) Q_{V_2}(v_2) = Q_{A_{1,3}}(a_{1,3}).$$

Hence, $A_{1,3}$ is independent of V_1 . Combining this fact with (204), we see that

$$I(V_1, V_2; A_{1,3}) = 0. \quad (210)$$

Since (195) and (196) imply that V_1 is a function of $(A_{1,2}, A_{1,3})$, and V_2 is a function of $(A_{1,3}, A_{2,3})$, it then follows that

$$0 < I(V_1; V_2) \stackrel{(210)}{=} I(V_1; V_2, A_{1,3}) \stackrel{(210)}{=} I(V_1; V_2 | A_{1,3}) \leq I(A_{1,2}; A_{2,3} | A_{1,3}), \quad (211)$$

which is a contradiction since (211) violates (194). Hence, we cannot achieve this corner point with the use of $A_{1,2}, A_{1,3}, A_{2,3}$ alone. This above argument also establishes that the corner point is not achievable using the functional mode of operation at intermediate nodes, thereby highlighting the following observation.

Remark 9: The portion of the strong coordination capacity region achievable by schemes with functional intermediate-node operation is, in general, a *strict* subset of the strong coordination capacity region.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have analyzed the communication and randomness resources required to establish strong coordination over a multi-hop line network. To derive an achievable scheme, we first build an intricate multi-layer structure of channel resolvability codes to generate the actions at all the nodes, which is then appropriately inverted to obtain a strong coordination code. While the resultant strong coordination code is not universally optimal, i.e., it is not known to achieve the optimal tradeoffs among common randomness rate, local randomness rates, and hop-by-hop communication rates, it is shown to achieve the best tradeoffs in several settings, including when all intermediate nodes operate under a functional regime, and when common randomness is plentiful.

The need for an intricate multi-layer scheme stems from a basic limitation in our understanding of the design of strong coordination codes for general multi-terminal problems: unlike in typicality-based schemes for a multi-user setups, where we can use joint typicality as the criterion to use a received signal (at some intermediate network node) to select a codeword for transmission, we do not have a similar criterion here to translate messages from one hop to the next. Consequently, a general way to design strong coordination codes where communicated messages are non-trivially correlated is open. However, through this work, we have made partial progress in this regard, since the achievable scheme allows messages in different hops to be correlated. However, there is limited control over the joint correlation, since it is determined implicitly by the codebooks at the time of construction.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Theorem 1

Before we proceed, we first use the following notation to simplify the analysis.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y} &\triangleq (X_1, \dots, X_h) \\ \hat{\mathbf{Y}} &\triangleq (\hat{X}_1, \dots, \hat{X}_h) \\ \mathbf{N} &\triangleq 2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-))} \end{aligned} \quad .$$

Let for any $S \subseteq \mathcal{F} \triangleq \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq h\}$, let $\mathcal{J}_S \triangleq \{(i, j) : \bar{\Phi}(i, j) \cap S \neq \emptyset\}$. Now, to find the conditions on the rates, we proceed in a fashion similar to [20] and [25].

$$\mathbb{E} [D_{\text{KL}}(Q_{\hat{\mathbf{Y}}}^{(1)} \| Q_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n})] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{y}^n} \left(\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{\mathbf{N}} \right) \log \left(\frac{\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm} Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm))}{\mathbf{N} Q_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \right) \right] \quad (212)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{\mathbf{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\log \left(\frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}{\mathbf{N} Q_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \right) \middle| \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm) \right] \right] \quad (213)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{\mathbf{N}} \log \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}{\mathbf{N} Q_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \middle| \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm) \right] \right) \right] \quad (214)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{\mathbf{N}} \log \left(1 + \sum_{S: (1,h) \notin S} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{(2^{n \sum_{s \notin S} (R_s^+ + R_s^-)}) Q_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \right) \right] \quad (215)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{a}^n} Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{a}^n) \log \left[1 + \sum_{S: (1, \mathbf{h}) \notin S} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}^n)}{2^{n(\sum_{s \notin S} (\mu_s^+ + \mu_s^-))} Q_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \right]. \quad (216)$$

The notation and arguments for the manipulations in (212)-(216) are as follows:

- (213) follows by the use of the law of iterated expectations, where the inner conditional expectation denotes the expectation over all random codeword constructions $\{\mathbf{A}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm) : \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm \neq \mathbf{m}^\pm\}$ conditioned on the codeword vector $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$;
- (214) follows from Jensen's inequality; and
- (215) follows by splitting the inner sum in (214) according to the indices where $\mathbf{m}^\pm$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm$ differ. Let $\Gamma(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm) \triangleq \{s \in \mathcal{F} : m_s^\pm \neq \tilde{m}_s^\pm\}$. For any pair of indices $(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)$, the following hold:
 - if $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{J}_{\Gamma(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}$, then $A_{i,j}(\mathbf{m}^\pm) = A_{i,j}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)$. This is because if $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{J}_{\Gamma(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}$, then by definition, $\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm = \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm$, and both $A_{i,j}(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$ and $A_{i,j}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)$ correspond to the codeword for $A_{i,j}$ corresponding to $\mathbf{m}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm = \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{\Phi(i,j)}^\pm$.
 - if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}_{\Gamma(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}$, then the random variables $A_{i,j}(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$, $A_{i,j}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)$ are conditionally independent given $\{A_{i,j}(\mathbf{m}^\pm) : (i, j) \notin \mathcal{J}_{\Gamma(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}\}$, which by the earlier remark, is exactly the same as $\{A_{i,j}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm) : (i, j) \notin \mathcal{J}_{\Gamma(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}\}$.

Combining both, we see that

$$\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm) \leftrightarrow \{A_{i,j}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm) : (i, j) \notin \mathcal{J}_{\Gamma(\mathbf{m}^\pm, \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)}\} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm). \quad (217)$$

Given $\mathbf{m}^\pm$, let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S} \triangleq \{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm : \Gamma(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm, \mathbf{m}^\pm) = S\}$. Then, we see that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm))}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \middle| \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm) \right] = \sum_S \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S}} \frac{\mathbb{E} [Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)) | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)]}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)}. \quad (218)$$

Note that if $(1, \mathbf{h}) \in S$, then $\mathcal{J}_S = \mathcal{F}$ and hence $\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)$ and $\mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)$ are independent, and hence

$$\sum_{S: (1, \mathbf{h}) \in S} \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S}} \frac{\mathbb{E} [Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)) | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)]}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} = \sum_{S: (1, \mathbf{h}) \in S} \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S}} \frac{1}{N} \leq 1. \quad (219)$$

Further, when $(1, \mathbf{h}) \notin S$, then $\mathcal{J}_S \subsetneq \mathcal{F}$. Using the chain in (217), we see that when $(1, \mathbf{h}) \notin S$,

$$\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S}} \frac{\mathbb{E} [Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm)) | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)]}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} = \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S}} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)}. \quad (220)$$

Combining the above arguments, we see that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm))}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \middle| \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm) \right] \leq 1 + \sum_{S: (1, \mathbf{h}) \notin S} \left(\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S}} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \right) \quad (221)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 1 + \sum_{S: (1, \mathbf{h}) \notin S} \frac{2^{n(\sum_{s \in S} (\mu_s^+ + \mu_s^-))} Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{NQ_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)} \quad (222)$$

$$= 1 + \sum_{S: (1, \mathbf{h}) \notin S} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{2^{n \sum_{s \notin S} (\mu_s^+ + \mu_s^-)} Q_{\mathbf{Y}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n)}, \quad (223)$$

where in (a) we use a counting argument that yields

$$|\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, S}| \leq 2^{n(\sum_{s \in S} (\mu_s^+ + \mu_s^-))}. \quad (224)$$

Finally, the required rate conditions can be derived from (216) by splitting the outer sum depending on whether $(\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{a}^n) \in T_\varepsilon^n[Q_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{A}}]$ or not. The sum for atypical realizations in (216) is no more than

$$\mathbb{P}[(\mathbf{Y}^n, \mathbf{A}^n) \notin T_\varepsilon^n[Q_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{A}}]] \cdot \log \left(1 + 2^{h^2} \eta_{\mathbf{Y}}^{-n} \right), \quad (225)$$

where $\eta_{\mathbf{Y}} = \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{support}(X_1, \dots, X_h)} Q_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{y})$. This term goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The contribution from typical realizations can be made to vanish asymptotically, if for each $S \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, $\{(\mu_{i,j}^+, \mu_{i,j}^-) : (i,j) \in \mathcal{F}\}$ satisfy:

$$\sum_{s \notin S} (\mu_s^+ + \mu_s^-) > I(\mathbf{Y}; A_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}) = I(X_1, \dots, X_h; \{A_{i,j} : (i,j) \notin \mathcal{J}_S\}). \quad (226)$$

That completes the proof of sufficient conditions for meeting (40). Now, to ensure that (41) is met, we note that by the random construction of the codebooks,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m}^-} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{M}^-}^{(1)}(\cdot | \mathbf{m}^-) \parallel \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n}^{(1)}) \right]}{2^{n(\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{F}} \mu_{i,j}^-)}} = \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{M}^-}^{(1)}(\cdot | \mathbf{1}) \parallel \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n}^{(1)}) \right] \quad (227)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{M}_h}^{(1)}(\cdot | \mathbf{1}) \parallel Q_{\hat{X}_1}^{\otimes n}) - D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n}^{(1)} \parallel Q_{\hat{X}_1}^{\otimes n}) \right], \quad (228)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the all-one vector of length $|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{h}{2}$. Note that the analysis in (212)-(216) ensures that the second term in the equation above vanishes as we let n diverge (provided (41) is met). So, we proceed almost exactly as we did in the first part of this proof.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n | \mathbf{M}^-}^{(1)}(\cdot | \mathbf{1}) \parallel Q_{\hat{X}_1}^{\otimes n}) \right] \quad (229)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x_1^n} \left(\frac{\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm: \mathbf{m}^- = \mathbf{1}} Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm))}{N'} \right) \log \left(\frac{\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm: \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^- = \mathbf{1}} Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^\pm))}{N' Q_{X_1}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n)} \right) \right] \quad (230)$$

$$\leq \sum_{x_1^n, \mathbf{a}^n} Q_{X_1 | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n, \mathbf{a}^n) \log \left[\sum_S \frac{Q_{X_1}^{\otimes n} | \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}(x_1^n | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}^n)}{2^{n(\sum_{s \notin S} \mu_s^+)} Q_{X_1}^{\otimes n}(x_1^n)} \right]. \quad (231)$$

The notation and arguments for the manipulations in (230)-(231) are as follows:

- We denote $N' = 2^{n(\mu_{1,2}^+ + \dots + \mu_{h-1,h}^+)}$.
- (231) follows from steps identical to those between (212) and (216). The sole difference is that $(X_1^n, \dots, X_h^n)$ is replaced by X_1^n , and the sums correspond to only all possible values taken by $\mathbf{M}^+$, since we are restricted to $\mathbf{M}^- = \mathbf{1}$.

As before, the sum of terms in (231) corresponding to atypical sequences yields a quantity no more than

$$\mathbb{P}[(X_1^n, \mathbf{A}^n) \notin T_\varepsilon^n[Q_{X_1 \mathbf{A}}]] \cdot \log \left(1 + 2^{h^2} \eta_{X_1}^{-n} \right), \quad (232)$$

where $\eta_{X_1} = \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{supp}(X_1)} Q_{X_1}(x_1)$. Note that the above quantity vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, the contribution from typical sequences can be made arbitrarily small if $\mu_{1,2}^+, \dots, \mu_{1,h}^+$ satisfy:

$$\sum_{s \notin S} \mu_s^+ > I(X_1; A_{\mathcal{J}_S^c}) = I(X_1, \dots, X_h; \{A_{i,j} : (i,j) \notin \mathcal{J}_S\}), \quad S \subseteq \mathcal{F}. \quad (233)$$

B. Proof of Theorem 2

We proceed in a way similar to the proof of Theorem 1. We use the following notation in this proof.

$$D_i(\mathbf{m}^\pm, k_{i-1}^\pm, l_i) \triangleq (B_{i-1,i}(\mathbf{m}^\pm, k_{i-1}^\pm), C_i(\mathbf{m}^\pm, k_{i-1}^\pm, l_i)), \quad (234)$$

$$\mathbf{Y}_i \triangleq (X_{i-1}, X_i), \quad (235)$$

$$\ell_i \triangleq (k_{i-1}^\pm, l_i), \quad (236)$$

$$\mathbf{N}_i \triangleq 2^{n(\kappa_{i-1}^+ + \kappa_{i-1}^- + \lambda_i)}. \quad (237)$$

Now, consider the following arguments.

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(\hat{Q}_{\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \parallel Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right) \right]}{2^{n(\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^- + \dots + \mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-)}} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(\hat{Q}_{\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(i, \underline{1})} \parallel Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1})) \right) \right] \quad (238)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{y}^n} \left(\frac{\sum_{\ell'_i} Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell'_i))}{N_i} \right) \log \left(\frac{\sum_{\ell''_i} Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell''_i))}{N_i Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}))} \right) \right] \quad (239)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{y}^n, \ell'_i} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell'_i))}{N_i} \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{\sum_{\ell''_i} Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell''_i))}{N_i Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}))} \middle| \begin{matrix} \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) \\ D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell'_i) \end{matrix} \right] \right] \quad (240)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \sum_{\mathbf{y}^n, \ell'_i} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell'_i))}{N_i} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{\ell''_i} Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell''_i))}{N_i Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}))} \middle| \begin{matrix} \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) \\ D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell'_i) \end{matrix} \right] \right] \quad (241)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \sum_{\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{a}^n, b^n, c^n} Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{a}^n, b^n, c^n) \log \left[1 + \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{a}^n, b^n, c^n)}{N_i Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{a}^n)} + \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} B_{i-1,i}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{a}^n, b^n)}{\frac{N_i}{2^{n r_i}} Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{a}^n)} \right]. \quad (242)$$

Now, to find the conditions on the rates, we proceed in a fashion similar to [20] and [25]. The notation and arguments for the manipulations in (239)-(242) are as follows:

- In (a), we let $\underline{1}$ to be the all-one vector of length $|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{h}{2}$. Note that (a) follows because the codebooks for $\mathbf{A}$, $B_{i-1,i}$, and C_i are generated in an i.i.d. fashion.
- In (b), the expectation is over the codebooks for $B_{i-1,i}$, and C_i and the realization of $\mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1})$.
- (c) follows by the use of the law of iterated expectations, where the inner conditional expectation denotes the expectation over all random codeword constructions $\{D_i(\underline{1}, \ell''_i) : \ell''_i \neq \ell'_i\}$ conditioned on the codeword $D_i(\underline{1}, \ell'_i)$;
- (d) follows from Jensen's inequality and by dropping the subscripts for the pmfs for the sake of simplicity; and
- Similar to (215), (e) follows by splitting the inner summation according to the components where $\ell'_i \triangleq (k_{i-1}^{\pm}, l'_i)$ and $\ell''_i \triangleq (k_{i-1}^{\pm}, l''_i)$ differ. Unity is an upper bound when the expectation is evaluated for terms corresponding to $k_{i-1}^{\pm} \neq k_{i-1}^{\pm}$, the second term is the result when the expectation is evaluated for $\ell'_i = \ell''_i$, and lastly, the third is the result from terms for which $k_{i-1}^{\pm} = k_{i-1}^{\pm}$ and $l'_i \neq l''_i$.

Finally, the rate conditions can be extracted from (242) by splitting the outer sum depending on whether $(\mathbf{y}^n, \mathbf{a}^n, b^n, c^n) \in T_\varepsilon^n[Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}]$ or not. The sum for non-typical realizations in (242) is no more than

$$\mathbb{P}[(\mathbf{Y}^n, \mathbf{A}^n, D_i^n) \notin T_\varepsilon^n[Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{A} D_i}]] \cdot \log(1 + 2\eta_{\mathbf{Y}_i}^-), \quad (243)$$

where $\eta_{\mathbf{Y}_i} = \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{supp}(X_{i-1}, X_i)} Q_{\mathbf{Y}_i}(\mathbf{y})$. This term in (243) goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The contribution from typical realizations can be observed to vanish asymptotically, provided (57)-(58) hold.

Now, consider (56). Let $N'_i \triangleq 2^{n(\kappa_{i-1}^+ + \lambda_i)}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm, k_{i-1}^\pm} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n, K_{i-1}^\pm}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}(\cdot | k_{i-1}^\pm) \parallel Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right) \right]}{2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) + \dots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-) + \kappa_{i-1}^-)}} \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[D_{\text{KL}} \left(\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n, K_{i-1}^\pm}^{(i, \underline{1})}(\cdot | 1) \parallel Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1})) \right) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{y}^n} \left(\frac{\sum_{\ell'_i: k_{i-1}^\pm = 1} Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(x_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \ell'_i))}{N'_i} \right) \log \left(\frac{\sum_{\tilde{\ell}_i: k_{i-1}^\pm = 1} Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A} D_i}^{\otimes n}(x_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}) D_i^n(\underline{1}, \tilde{\ell}_i))}{N'_i Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(x_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1}))} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (244)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_{i-1}^n, \mathbf{a}^n \\ b^n, c^n}} Q_{X_{i-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}^n, \mathbf{a}^n, b^n, c^n) \log \left[1 + \frac{Q_{X_{i-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}_i}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{a}^n, b^n, c^n)}{N_i' Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{a}^n)} + \frac{Q_{X_{i-1} \mathbf{A} B_{i-1, i}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{a}^n, b^n)}{\frac{N_i'}{2^{n r_i}} Q_{X_{i-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}^n | \mathbf{a}^n)} \right]. \quad (245)$$

The notation and arguments for the manipulations in the above equations are as follows:

- In (a), we let $\underline{1}$ to be the all-one vector of length $|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{h}{2}$. As before, (a) follows because the codebooks for $\mathbf{A}$, $B_{i-1, i}$, and C_i are generated in an i.i.d. fashion.
- In (b), the expectation is over the section of codebooks for $B_{i-1, i}$, and C_i corresponding to $k_{i-1}^- = 1$ and realization of $\mathbf{A}^n(\underline{1})$.
- (c) follows from arguments similar to those in (239)-(242).

Lastly, as before, by separating the contributions of typical and non-typical sequences, we see that the expression in (245) can be made to vanish if:

$$\kappa_{i-1}^+ + \lambda_i > I(X_{i-1}; B_{i-1, i}, C_i | \mathbf{A}) \stackrel{(12)}{=} I(X_{i-1}; B_{i-1, i} | \mathbf{A}), \quad (246)$$

$$\kappa_{i-1}^+ > I(X_{i-1}; B_{i-1, i} | \mathbf{A}). \quad (247)$$

Note that the former constraint is redundant, thereby completing this proof.

C. Proof of Lemma 3

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let us denote $N \triangleq 2^{n((\mu_{1,2}^+ + \mu_{1,2}^-) \cdots + (\mu_{h-1,h}^+ + \mu_{h-1,h}^-))}$. Recall from Remarks 4 and 5 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_1^n \dots \hat{X}_h^n}^{(1)} - Q_{X_1 \dots X_h}^{\otimes n} \right\|_1 + \sum_{i=2}^h \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \frac{\left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{i-1}^n \hat{X}_i^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(i, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{i-1} X_i | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1}{N} \right] = 0. \quad (248)$$

Let for $j = 1, \dots, h-1$,

$$\delta_i \triangleq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left\| Q_{X_j | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{j=i+1}^h \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_j^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{j-1}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_i \dots X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \right), \quad (249)$$

where we denote

$$\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_j^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{j-1}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \triangleq \frac{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n \hat{X}_j^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}}{\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{j-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)}}. \quad (250)$$

First, consider δ_{h-1} .

$$\delta_{h-1} \triangleq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left\| Q_{X_{h-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{h-1}^n}^{(h, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-1}, X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \right) \quad (251)$$

$$\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left\| Q_{X_{h-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{h-1}^n}^{(h, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-1}^n \hat{X}_h^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(h, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \right\|_1 \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-1}^n \hat{X}_h^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(h, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-1}, X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \right] \quad (252)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left\| Q_{X_{h-1} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) - \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-1}^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(h, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \right\|_1 \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-1}^n \hat{X}_h^n | \mathbf{A}^n}^{(h, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-1}, X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \right] \stackrel{(248)}{=} 0. \quad (253)$$

Now, for $j > 1$, the following applies.

$$\delta_{h-j} \triangleq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left\| Q_{X_{h-j} | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{s=h-j+1}^h \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_s^n | \mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{s-1}^n}^{(s, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-j} \dots X_h | \mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | \mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \right) \quad (254)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left\| \left[Q_{X_{h-j}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) - \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-j}^n|\mathbf{A}^n}^{(h-j+1, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \right] \prod_{s=h-j+1}^h \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_s^n|\mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{s-1}^n}^{(s, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \right\|_1 \\ & + \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left\| \left[\hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-j}^n \hat{X}_{h-j+1}^n|\mathbf{A}^n}^{(h-j+1, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-j} X_{h-j+1}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right] \prod_{s=h-j+2}^h \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_s^n|\mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{s-1}^n}^{(s, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \right\|_1 \\ & + \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left\| Q_{X_{h-j} X_{h-j+1}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{s=h-j+2}^h Q_{\hat{X}_s^n|\mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{s-1}^n}^{(s, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-j} \dots X_h|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \end{aligned} \right] \\
& \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}} \\
& \left[\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left\| Q_{X_{h-j}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) - \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-j}^n|\mathbf{A}^n}^{(h-j+1, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \right\|_1 \\ & + \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_{h-j}^n \hat{X}_{h-j+1}^n|\mathbf{A}^n}^{(h-j+1, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-j} X_{h-j+1}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \\ & + \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left\| Q_{X_{h-j+1}|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{s=h-j+2}^h Q_{\hat{X}_s^n|\mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{s-1}^n}^{(s, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} - Q_{X_{h-j+1} \dots X_h|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1 \end{aligned} \right] \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{N}}{\mathbf{N}} \\
& \stackrel{(248)}{=} \delta_{h-j+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{255}$$

Note that in (a), we have used the fact that (12) implies $X_i \leftrightarrow (X_{i+1}, \mathbf{A}) \leftrightarrow (X_{i+2}, \dots, X_h)$, which then allows us to eliminate X_{h-j} within the third variational distance term. By induction, we then conclude that $\delta_1 = 0$. Finally, by transferring the summation inside the norm, we see that the following holds.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} \left(Q_{X_i|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \prod_{j=i+1}^h \hat{Q}_{\hat{X}_j^n|\mathbf{A}^n, \hat{X}_{j-1}^n}^{(j, \mathbf{m}^\pm)} \right) - \sum_{\mathbf{m}^\pm} Q_{X_i \dots X_h|\mathbf{A}}^{\otimes n}(\cdot|\mathbf{A}^n(\mathbf{m}^\pm)) \right\|_1}{\mathbf{N}} = 0. \tag{256}$$

The proof is then complete by invoking the triangle inequality to combine the above result with (49).

D. Message Selection at Node 1

Let pmf $Q_{D_1, D_2 Y}$ be given. Consider the a nested channel resolvability code for generating $Y \sim Q_Y$ via the channel $Q_{Y|D_1, \dots, D_2}$. Let the codebook structure be as given in Fig. 7, where the codebook for D_i is constructed randomly using $Q_{D_i|D_{i-1} \dots D_1}$. Suppose that the rates of the codebooks satisfy

$$\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_i > I(Y; D_1, \dots, D_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \tag{257}$$

For this choice of rates, it can be shown that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can find $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n > n_0$,

$$\mathbb{E} [\| Q_{\hat{Y}^n} - Q_Y^{\otimes n} \|_1] \leq \varepsilon, \tag{258}$$

where

$$Q_{\hat{Y}^n} \triangleq \frac{1}{2^{n(\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k)}} \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_k} Q_{Y|D_1 \dots D_k}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | D_1^n(l_1), D_2^n(l_1, l_2), \dots, D_k^n(l_1, \dots, l_k)). \tag{259}$$

Now suppose that we aim to realize a random selection of indices $(\hat{L}_1, \dots, \hat{L}_k)$ using a function $\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ that depends on the codebooks $\mathcal{C}$ and takes as inputs, an independent and uniform random seed S and the output of the channel $\hat{Y}^n$. We require that the conditional pmf of the selected indices given the channel output match the *a posteriori* probability of the indices $(L_1, \dots, L_k)$ given $\hat{Y}^n$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} [\| Q_{\hat{L}_1, \dots, \hat{L}_k, \hat{Y}^n} - Q_{L_1, \dots, L_k, \hat{Y}^n} \|_1] \leq \varepsilon. \tag{260}$$

The following result characterizes the rate of random seed required to realize such a random selection.

Theorem 6: Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the random codebook structure given in Fig. 7 with rates $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k$ that satisfy (257). Let $\hat{Y}^n$ denote the output of the channel when the input is a codeword tuple that is uniformly selected from channel resolvability codebook. Let $S \sim \text{unif}([1, 2^{nR_S}])$, where

$$R_S > \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k - I(Y; D_1, \dots, D_k).$$




Fig. 7. A nested codebook structure for channel resolvability and the codeword selection problem.

Then, there exists a function $\Lambda_C : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \llbracket 1, 2^{nR_S} \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket$ (that depends on the instance of the realized codebooks) such that $(\hat{L}_1, \dots, \hat{L}_k) \triangleq \Lambda_C(\hat{Y}^n, S)$ satisfies:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\|Q_{\hat{L}_1, \dots, \hat{L}_k, \hat{Y}^n} - Q_{L_1, \dots, L_k, Y^n}\|_1 \right] = 0, \quad (261)$$

where the expectation is over all random codebooks.

Proof: Let $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ be chosen such that

$$R_S - (\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k) + I(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y) - 4\delta \log_2(|\mathcal{D}_1| |\mathcal{D}_2| \dots |\mathcal{D}_k| |\mathcal{Y}|) > \varepsilon. \quad (262)$$

Let $(L_1, \dots, L_k) \sim \text{unif}(\llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket)$, $L^i \triangleq (L_1, \dots, L_i)$ and $\hat{L}^i \triangleq (\hat{L}_1, \dots, \hat{L}_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. By the random codebook construction, it follows that $(D_1^n(L_1), D_2^n(L^2), \dots, D_k^n(L^k), \hat{Y}^n)$ is indistinguishable from the output of a DMS $Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}$. Hence, by [27, Theorem 1.1], it follows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[(D_1^n(L_1), D_2^n(L^2), \dots, D_k^n(L^k), \hat{Y}^n) \notin T_\delta^n[Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}] \right] \leq 2K e^{-n\delta^2 \eta}, \quad (263)$$

where $\eta \triangleq \min_{Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y} \in \text{supp}(Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y})} Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}(d_1, \dots, d_k, y)$, and

$$K \triangleq |\mathcal{D}_1| |\mathcal{D}_2| \dots |\mathcal{D}_k| |\mathcal{Y}|. \quad (264)$$

Now, for a codebook $\mathcal{C}_o \triangleq \{(d_1^n(l_1), \dots, d_k^n(l^k)) : l^k \in \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket\}$, and channel output $y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n$, let

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}_o}(y^n) \triangleq \{l^k : (d_1^n(l_1), \dots, d_k^n(l^k), y^n) \in T_\delta^n[Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}]\}. \quad (265)$$

Then, by Lemma 4 below, the following holds for sufficiently large n .

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n)| \right] \leq (k+1) 2^{n(\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k - I(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y) + 2\delta \log_2 K)}. \quad (266)$$

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of codebooks $\mathcal{C}_o \triangleq \{(d_1^n(l_1), \dots, d_k^n(l^k)) : l^k \in \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket\}$ such that:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[(d_1^n(L_1), \dots, d_k^n(L^k), \hat{Y}^n) \notin T_\delta^n[Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}] \mid \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_o \right] \leq \sqrt{2K e^{-n\delta^2 \eta}} \quad (267)$$

$$(k+1)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n)| \mid \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_o \right] \leq 2^{n(\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k - I(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y) + 3\delta \log_2 K)}. \quad (268)$$

By Markov's inequality, we then have

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{C} \notin \mathcal{G}] \leq \sqrt{2K e^{-n\delta^2 \eta}} + 2^{-n\delta \log_2 K}. \quad (269)$$

Now, pick $\mathcal{C}^* \triangleq \{(d_1^{*n}(l_1), \dots, d_k^{*n}(l^k)) : l^k \in \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket\} \in \mathcal{G}$ and define $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*}$ by

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*} = \left\{ y^n : \mathbb{P} \left[(d_1^{*n}(L_1), \dots, d_k^{*n}(L^k), \hat{Y}^n) \notin T_\delta^n[Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}] \mid \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^* \right] \leq \sqrt[4]{2K e^{-n\delta^2 \eta}} \right\}. \quad (270)$$

Again, by an application of Markov's inequality, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y}^n \notin \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*} | \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^*] \leq \sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}} + 2^{-n\delta \log_2 K}. \quad (271)$$

Further, it also follows that for each $y^n \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*}$,

$$\sum_{l^k \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}^*}(y^n)} Q_{L_1 \dots L_k \hat{Y}^n}(l^k, y^n) \stackrel{(270)}{\leq} \sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}}, \quad (272)$$

where $Q_{L_1 \dots L_k \hat{Y}^n}$ is the joint pmf between indices and the output induced by $\mathcal{C}^*$. Then, from Lemma 5 below, for each $y^n \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*}$, we can select a function $f_{y^n} : \llbracket 1, 2^{nR_S} \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket$ such that

$$\| Q_{f_{y^n}(S)} - Q_{L_1 \dots L_k | \hat{Y}^n = y^n} \|_1 \leq \frac{|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}^*}(y^n)|}{2^{nR_S}} + \sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}} \quad (273)$$

$$\leq (k+1)2^{n(\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k - I(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y) + 4\delta \log_2 S - R_S)} + \sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}} \quad (274)$$

$$\stackrel{(262)}{\leq} (k+1)2^{-n\varepsilon} + \sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}}, \quad (275)$$

where $S \sim \text{unif}(\llbracket 1, 2^{nR_S} \rrbracket)$. Pick $l^{*k} \in \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket$. Now, we can piece together these functions to define

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^*}(y^n, S) \triangleq \begin{cases} f_{y^n}(S), & y^n \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*} \\ l^{*k}, & y^n \notin \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*} \end{cases}. \quad (276)$$

By construction, we now have

$$\sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}^*}} Q_{\hat{Y}^n | \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^*}(y^n) \| Q_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^*}(y^n, S)} - Q_{L^k | \hat{Y}^n = y^n} \|_1 \leq (k+1)2^{-n\varepsilon} + \sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}}. \quad (277)$$

Combining the above bound with (271) and the fact that the variation distance between two pms is bounded above by 2, we obtain

$$\sum_{y^n} Q_{\hat{Y}^n | \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^*}(y^n) \| Q_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^*}(y^n, S)} - Q_{L^k | \hat{Y}^n = y^n} \|_1 \leq (k+1)2^{-n\varepsilon} + 3\sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}} + 2 \cdot 2^{-n\delta \log_2 K}. \quad (278)$$

Since the RHS does not depend on the choice of $\mathcal{C}^*$ in $\mathcal{G}$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\| Q_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(y^n, S)} - Q_{L^k | \hat{Y}^n = y^n} \|_1 \mid \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{G} \right] \leq (k+1)2^{-n\varepsilon} + 3\sqrt[4]{2Ke^{-n\delta^2\eta}} + 2 \cdot 2^{-n\delta \log_2 K}. \quad (279)$$

Next, using the fact that the variational distance between two pmfs is no more than 2, we also have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\| Q_{\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(y^n, S)} - Q_{L^k | \hat{Y}^n = y^n} \|_1 \mid \mathcal{C} \notin \mathcal{G} \right] \leq 2. \quad (280)$$

Finally, combining the above two equations with (269) completes the claim. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 4: Consider the codebook construction of Fig. 7 with codebook sizes satisfying (257). Let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\cdot)$ be as defined in (265). Then, for n sufficiently large,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n)| \right] \leq (k+1)2^{n(\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k - I(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y) - 2\delta \log_2(|\mathcal{D}_1| |\mathcal{D}_2| \dots |\mathcal{D}_k| |\mathcal{Y}|))}. \quad (281)$$

Proof: Due to the random construction of the codebooks, we see that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n)| \right] = \sum_{l^k} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}\{l^k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n)\} \mid L^k = (1, \dots, 1) \right]. \quad (282)$$

To evaluate the conditional expectation, we partition the space $\llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket$ as follows.

$$\mathcal{S}_i = \left\{ l^k : \begin{array}{ll} l_j = 1, & j < i \\ l_{j+1} \neq 1, & j = i \end{array} \right\}, \quad i = 0, \dots, k. \quad (283)$$

Note that $\bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathcal{S}_i = \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_k} \rrbracket$. By the random nature of codebook construction, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[(l_1, \dots, l_k) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n) \mid L^k = (1, \dots, 1) \right] = \mathbb{P} \left[(l'_1, \dots, l'_k) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n) \mid L^k = (1, \dots, 1) \right]. \quad (284)$$

for any pair of tuples $(l_1, \dots, l_k), (l'_1, \dots, l'_k) \in \mathcal{S}_j$, $j = 0, \dots, k$. Let for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$, $\ell^k(j)$ be chosen such that $\ell^k(j) \in \mathcal{S}_j$, and thus, due to (284), we have

$$\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n)|] = \sum_{j=0}^k |\mathcal{S}_j| \mathbb{P} [\ell^k(j) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n) | L^k = (1, \dots, 1)] \leq \sum_{j=0}^k \left[\prod_{\iota > j} 2^{n\nu_\iota} \right] \eta_j, \quad (285)$$

where we let $\eta_j \triangleq \mathbb{P} [\ell^k(j) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n) | L^k = (1, \dots, 1)]$, $j = 0, \dots, k$. Clearly, $\eta_k \leq 1$, and η_0 is exactly the probability that realizations $(D_1^n, D_2^n, \dots, D_k^n) \sim Q_{D_1 \dots D_k}^{\otimes n}$ and $Y^n \sim Q_Y^{\otimes n}$ selected independent of one another are jointly δ -letter typical. Thus, by [27, Theorem 1.1], it follows that

$$\eta_0 = \sum_{(d_1^n, \dots, d_k^n, y^n) \in T_{\delta}^n [Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}]} Q_{D_1 \dots D_k}(d_1^n, \dots, d_k^n) Q_Y(y^n) \quad (286)$$

$$\leq 2^{-nI(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y) + n\delta(H(D_1, \dots, D_k, Y) + H(D_1, \dots, D_k) + H(Y))} \leq 2^{-n(I(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y) - 2\delta \log_2 K)}, \quad (287)$$

where K is defined in (264). Now, when $0 < j < k$, we observe that η_j is the probability that $(D_1^n, D_2^n, \dots, D_k^n) \sim Q_{D_1 \dots D_k}^{\otimes n}$ and Y^n (i.e., the output when $(D_1, \dots, D_j)$ is sent through the channel $Q_{Y|D_1, \dots, D_j}$) are jointly δ -letter typical. Therefore, by use of [27, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2], we see that

$$\eta_j \leq \sum_{(d_1^n, \dots, d_k^n, y^n) \in T_{\delta}^n [Q_{D_1 \dots D_k Y}]} Q_{D_{j+1} \dots D_k | D_1 \dots D_j}(d_{j+1}^n, \dots, d_k^n | d_1^n, \dots, d_j^n) Q_{D_1 \dots D_j Y}(d_1^n, \dots, d_j^n, y^n) \quad (288)$$

$$\leq 2^{-n(I(D_{j+1}, \dots, D_k; Y | D_1, \dots, D_j) - 2\delta \log_2 K)}. \quad (289)$$

Finally, combining the bounds for $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_k$ and (285), we see that

$$\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{Y}^n)|] \leq 1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{n(\nu_{j+1} + \dots + \nu_k - I(D_{j+1}, \dots, D_k; Y | D_1, \dots, D_j) + 2\delta \log_2 K)}. \quad (290)$$

Finally, the claim follows since (257) ensures that

$$\max_{j=0, \dots, k-1} \left[\nu_{j+1} + \dots + \nu_k - I(D_{j+1}, \dots, D_k; Y | D_1, \dots, D_j) \right] = \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_k - I(D_1, \dots, D_k; Y).$$

■

Lemma 5: Let Q be a pmf on a finite set $\mathcal{A}$ such that there exists $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ with $|\mathcal{B}| = M$ and $\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} Q(b) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Now, suppose that $L \sim \text{unif}([1, \ell])$. Then, there exists $f : [1, \ell] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $Q_{f(L)}$, the pmf of $f(L)$, satisfies $\|Q_{f(L)} - Q\|_1 \leq \varepsilon + \frac{M}{\ell}$.

Proof: Let $b_1 \preceq b_2 \preceq \dots \preceq b_M$ be an ordering of $\mathcal{B}$. Let $p_0 = 0$, and for $1 \leq i \leq M$, let $p_i \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^i Q(b_j)$ denote the cumulative mass function. Now, let $N_i \triangleq \lfloor p_i \ell \rfloor$, $i = 0, \dots, M$, and let $f : [1, N_M] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be defined by the pre-images via $f^{-1}(b_i) = \{N_{i-1} + 1, \dots, N_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, M$. Fig. 8 provides an illustration of these operations. Now, by construction, we have

$$0 \leq p_i - \mathbb{P}[f(L) \in \{b_1, \dots, b_i\}] \leq \ell^{-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M. \quad (291)$$




Fig. 8. An illustration of approximating a pmf using a function of a uniform RV.

Consequently, we also have for any $i = 1, \dots, M$,

$$-\ell^{-1} \leq p_i - p_{i-1} - Q_{f(L)}(b_i) = Q(b_i) - Q_{f(L)}(b_i) \leq \ell^{-1}. \quad (292)$$

Hence, we see that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |Q(a) - Q_{f(L)}(a)| = \sum_{i=1}^M |Q(b_i) - Q_{f(L)}(b_i)| + \mathbb{P}[A \notin \mathcal{B}] \stackrel{(292)}{\leq} \frac{M}{\ell} + \varepsilon. \quad (293)$$

■

E. Message Selection at Nodes $2, \dots, h-1$

Let pmf $p_{D_1, D_2, Y}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Suppose that $2^{n\nu_1}$ codewords $\{D_1^n(l_1) : l_1 = 1, \dots, 2^{n\nu_1}\}$ be selected such that $D_1^n(l_1) \sim Q_{D_1}^{\otimes n}$ for each $l_1 = 1, \dots, 2^{n\nu_1}$. Note that the selection of the codewords may not be independent of one another. Now, for each $l_1 \in \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket$, generate a codebook for D_2 such that codewords $\{D_2^n(i_1, i_2, i'_2) : i_2 \in \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_2} \rrbracket, i'_2 \in \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu'_2} \rrbracket\}$ are selected independently with each codeword selected using $\prod_{k=1}^n Q_{D_2|D_1, k}(i_1)$. Suppose that

$$\nu_2 > I(Y; D_2|D_1). \quad (294)$$

For this choice of rates, it can be shown that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can find $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n > n_0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{Y}^n|D_1^n(L_1)}^{(L_1, L'_2)} - Q_{Y|D_1}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | D_1^n(L_1)) \right\|_1 \right] = \sum_{l_1, l_2} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{Y}^n|D_1^n(l_1)}^{(l_1, l'_2)} - Q_{Y|D_1}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | D_1^n(l_1)) \right\|_1}{2^{n(\nu_1 + \nu'_2)}} \leq \varepsilon, \quad (295)$$

where

$$\hat{Q}_{\hat{Y}^n|D_1^n(l_1)}^{(l_1, l'_2)} \triangleq \sum_{l_2=1}^{2^{n\nu_2}} \frac{Q_{Y|D_1, D_2}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | D_1^n(l_1), D_2^n(l_1, l_2, l'_2))}{2^{n\nu_2}}. \quad (296)$$

Remark 10: Since the codewords $D_1^n(\cdot)$ are identically distributed (but not necessarily independent),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{Y}^n|D_1^n(L_1)}^{(L_1, L'_2)} - Q_{Y|D_1}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | D_1^n(L_1)) \right\|_1 \right] = \left\| \hat{Q}_{\hat{Y}^n|D_1^n(1)}^{(1, 1)} - Q_{Y|D_1}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | D_1^n(1)) \right\|_1. \quad (297)$$

■




Fig. 9. A nested codebook structure for channel resolvability and the codeword selection problem.

Now suppose that as in Appendix D, one would like to characterize the amount of randomness required to generate randomly $\hat{L}_2$ using a function Λ_C (that depends on the codebooks $\mathcal{C}$) that takes as inputs a uniform random seed S , the output of the channel $\hat{Y}^n$, and the actual (L_1, L'_2) that was used to generate the channel output. As given in Fig. 8, we want $\hat{L}_2$ to mimic L_2 and that the joint correlation of the RV $\hat{L}_2$ with L_1, L'_2 and the realized $\hat{Y}^n$ is arbitrarily close to $Q_{L_1, L_2, L'_2, \hat{Y}^n}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| Q_{L_1, \hat{L}_2, L'_2, \hat{Y}^n} - Q_{L_1, L_2, L'_2, \hat{Y}^n} \right\|_1 \right] \leq \varepsilon. \quad (298)$$

The following result characterizes the rate of randomness required to realize this random index selection.

Theorem 7: Consider the codebook structure described above with ν_1 satisfying (294). Let $\hat{Y}^n$ denote the channel output when the input is a codeword pair selected uniformly from the codebooks. Let

$$R_S > \nu_2 - I(Y; D_2|D_1). \quad (299)$$

Then, there exists a function $\Lambda_C : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_1} \rrbracket \times \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_2'} \rrbracket \times \llbracket 1, 2^{nR_S} \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket 1, 2^{n\nu_2} \rrbracket$ (that depends on the instance of the realized codebooks) such that $\hat{L}_2 \triangleq \Lambda_C(\hat{Y}^n, L_1, L_2', S)$ satisfies:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\| Q_{L_1, \hat{L}_2, L_2', \hat{Y}^n} - Q_{L_1, L_2, L_2', \hat{Y}^n} \|_1 \right] = 0, \quad (300)$$

where the expectation is over all random codebook realizations.

Proof: The proof mirrors exactly those of Theorem 6 and its associated lemmas, and is omitted. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] B. N. Vellambi, J. Kliewer, and M. Bloch, “Strong coordination over multi-hop line networks,” in *2015 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, Oct. 2015, pp. 192–196.
- [2] —, “Strong coordination over a line when actions are markovian,” in *50th Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*, Mar. 2015.
- [3] P. Cuff, H. Permuter, and T. M. Cover, “Coordination capacity,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4181–4206, Sep. 2010.
- [4] P. Grover and A. Sahai, “Implicit and explicit communication in decentralized control,” in *48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton 2010)*, Sept 2010, pp. 278–285.
- [5] P. Cuff and L. Zhao, “Coordination using implicit communication,” in *2011 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW 2011)*, Oct 2011, pp. 467–471.
- [6] G. Ranade and A. Sahai, “Implicit communication in multiple-access settings,” in *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT 2011)*, July 2011, pp. 998–1002.
- [7] S. S. Vembu and S. Verdú, “Generating random bits from an arbitrary source: fundamental limits,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 1322–1332, Sep 1995.
- [8] H. Nagaoka, *Seminar notes*. Graduate School of Information Systems, University of Electro-communications, 1996.
- [9] Y. Steinberg and S. Verdú, “Simulation of random processes and rate-distortion theory,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 63–86, Jan 1996.
- [10] T. S. Han, *Information-Spectrum Methods in Information Theory*, 1st ed. Springer, 2003.
- [11] T. S. Han and S. Verdú, “Approximation theory of output statistics,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 752–772, May 1993.
- [12] Y. Steinberg and S. Verdú, “Channel simulation and coding with side information,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 634–646, May 1994.
- [13] P. Cuff, “Distributed channel synthesis,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7071–7096, Nov. 2013.
- [14] M. H. Yassaee, A. Gohari, and M. R. Aref, “Channel simulation via interactive communications,” in *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, July 2012, pp. 3053–3057.
- [15] A. Gohari and V. Anantharam, “Generating dependent random variables over networks,” in *2011 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, Oct. 2011, pp. 698–702.
- [16] P. Cuff, “Communication requirements for generating correlated random variables,” in *2008 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, July 2008, pp. 1393–1397.
- [17] M. L. Treust, “Correlation between channel state and information source with empirical coordination constraint,” in *2014 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW 2014)*, Nov 2014, pp. 272–276.
- [18] —, “Empirical coordination with two-sided state information and correlated source and state,” in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT 2015)*, June 2015, pp. 466–470.
- [19] —, “Empirical coordination with channel feedback and strictly causal or causal encoding,” in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT 2015)*, June 2015, pp. 471–475.
- [20] M. Bloch and J. Kliewer, “Strong coordination over a three-terminal relay network,” in *2014 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, Nov. 2014, pp. 646–650.
- [21] F. Haddadpour, M. H. Yassaee, A. Gohari, and M. R. Aref, “Coordination via a relay,” in *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, July 2012, pp. 3048–3052.
- [22] A. Bereyhi, M. Bahrani, and a. M. R. A. M. Mirmohseni, “Empirical coordination in a triangular multiterminal network,” in *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT 2013)*, July 2013, pp. 2149–2153.
- [23] B. Larrousse, S. Lasaulce, and M. Bloch, “Coordination in distributed networks via coded actions with application to power control,” *submitted to the IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Online: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1501.03685v3.pdf>.
- [24] B. Larrousse, S. Lasaulce, and M. Wigger, “Coordination in state-dependent distributed networks: The two-agent case,” in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT 2015)*, June 2015, pp. 979–983.
- [25] M. Bloch and J. Kliewer, “Strong coordination over a line network,” in *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, July 2013, pp. 2319–2323.
- [26] S. Satpathy and P. Cuff, “Secure cascade channel synthesis,” in *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, July 2013, pp. 2955–2959. Also available online: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.4314v1>.
- [27] G. Kramer, “Topics in multi-user information theory,” *Found. Trends Commun. Inf. Theory*, vol. 4, no. 4-5, pp. 265–444, 2007.
- [28] A. E. Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 2011.